1891-92
(L. R.)

File No. 32 of 91
Serial No. 1-40

Sub — Alleged Embezzlement of salt license fees in the Kolar Taluk

Rt. 59 of 9

Memo & Enclosures of this file kept Separately

1891 -- 92

G. R. S. IX-5]

*Previous references.*

File No. 32 of

Serial Nos. 1

**191**

( L. R. )

*Later references.*

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*Serial Nos.*

**Part B for**

SUBJECT.

Alleged Embezzlement of Salt License fee in the Kolar Dy. against Srinivasa R[illegible]avachar, late Head Gumasta &c.

Indexed

88

All the [illegible] to [illegible] Recorded

20 Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, Department of Revenue, Agriculture and Commerce

20th January 1879.

---

From the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, Simla, No. 763-R. 73, of Bangalore, 26th September 1878.

In acknowledging the receipt of memo No. 4 R. of the 10th June 1878 requesting to be furnished with an expression of the Chief Commissioner's opinion on the question of the entire suppression of earth-salt manufacture in Mysore I am directed to submit the following for the consideration and orders of the Government of India.

2. In this office Letter No. 260-R. 27 dated 3rd October 1873, Colonel Meade expressed himself strongly opposed to such a measure, on the score of the hardships it would entail on the population in remote parts of the Province who are too poor to purchase sea-salt at the high prices at which alone it could be obtained in such localities, and who would therefore have to deny themselves and their cattle this necessary of life, if deprived of the cheaper though inferior earth-salt. He deprecated the measure also on the ground that it would deprive considerable classes of people no

engaged in the manufacture of their accustomed industry and means of living. He considered it sufficient to interdict altogether the exportation of the article into Her Majesty's Territories, and also, to ensure this the better, to forbid its manufacture within five miles of the frontier.

3. These proposals received the sanction of the Government of India, but the suppression of the manufacture within the five miles area referred to was but very partially carried into effect. Several pans were closed, and some compensation was paid, but as the measure led to many complaints, and claims for compensation, both Mr. Dalyell and Mr. Saunders were led to postpone further action in the matter.

4. The Madras Government having been referred to, expressed themselves as in no way desirous of such partial suppression, which whilst entailing large compensation could not effectually prevent the exportation of earth-salt into British territory. They seemed to be of opinion that the Mysore Government was not justified in attempting the suppression of such a necessary of life.

5. On representing the foregoing circumstances to the Government of India, Mr. Saunders in his Office letter No. 5057-R. 70, Dated 19th September 1877, urged the concurrence of the measures of

of partial suppression proposed by Colonel [illegible] and suggested the enhancement of duty on earth-salt in the frontier talukas as the better means of preventing its export.

6. In the reference now again made on the subject the Government of India would seem to have been moved by a consideration of the order lately issued by them for the entire suppression of the manufacture in the Madras Territories and of the reasons on which that order is based.

7. No doubt earth-salt is not only very inferior in quality, but the cost of its manufacture is so high in comparison with that of sea-salt, that if both were under the same Government liable to the same duty, the manufacture of earth-salt would cease. There could be no unfairness in suppressing a trade so obviously unprofitable and turning the industry employed on it into other and more useful channels.

8. In Mysore, however, the circumstances are different. The earth-salt is a local industry. The sea-salt is an imported article. If it were a free article or one liable only to a moderate custom duty, it might be expected in a natural process to displace the earth-salt of Mysore. But the sea-salt being charged with a very high rate

ly, the untaxed or lightly taxed earth-salt becomes, relatively much cheaper and continues to be consumed in remote parts by the poorer classes to whom cheapness is a great object. It would be no advantage either to the Mysore people or to the Mysore Government to displace the earth-salt which is a local manufacture by the imported sea-salt, which has to pay such a high revenue to the British Government.

9. In this matter of salt, indeed, the inland native states would seem to be somewhat unfairly weighted as compared with those which enjoy the advantage of a sea board, and which import salt both from British Indian ports and from foreign countries at prime cost. Mysore, in using the excised sea-salt, pays to the Madras Government on the 800,000 maunds, which it at present consumes, a duty of 8 lakhs of rupees, at the rate of Rs 1 per maund. This, hereafter, at the enhanced rate of 2-8-0 per maund, would be 20 lakhs.

10. This represents so much loss of resources to the people of Mysore for the benefit of the Madras Government, a loss which need not be incurred if the Mysore Government were allowed to import its salt at prime cost.

11. Under these circumstances the Chief

Chief Commissioner thinks that the suppression of the manufacture of earth-salt in Mysore cannot be reasonably resorted to, except on payment of due compensation not only to the manufacturers but also to the Mysore Government for its loss of revenue. Even then there would be injustice and hardship to the present consumers of the earth-salt.

12. Under such circumstances, such suppression is not in Mr. Gordon's opinion desirable. The Madras Government does not urge it. The manufacture is local, limited in its character and shows a tendency to diminish as sea-salt becomes more accessible with the improved means of communication. Where the latter is easily obtainable, all but the poorer classes would prefer it even at the higher price.

13. The produce of earth-salt manufacture in Mysore appears to have fallen off subsequent to 1869-70 from 25,000 kandis or 1,75,000 Indian maunds to 15,000 kandis or even 10,000 kandis per annum.

14. The duty on the salt-pans might be somewhat raised, but not to such an extent as could prove prohibitory of export without at the same time leading to the suppression of the manufacture. The levy of an export duty is objectionable and open to abuse.

15. In this view of the subject the Chief —

Commissioner would urge the cessation of all interference with the manufacture, and the cancelment of Colonel Meade's proposal to suppress it partially.

10. There would be no objection to the prohibition of the export of Mysore earth-salt into British Territory. Indeed this has already been done, and the prohibition will now be strongly insisted on. The British Government might levy a heavy penalty also on its import. On a very extensive frontier there would probably be some smuggling, practically not very much and limited probably to the very poor frontier villages. The Revenue interests of the Madras Presidency would not, I am to submit, be materially affected, and in considering this question the large amount of sea-borne salt which this Province takes, paying to the Madras Government from 15 to 20 lakhs for it should, Mr. Gordon thinks, be borne in mind.

---

From the Under-Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, No. 22, P., Dated Simla, the 18th November 1878.

I am directed to acknowledge your Secretary's letter No. 1704-73, P., Dated 20th September 1878, submitting your view on the question of suppressing the manufacture of earth-salt in Mysore.

2. In reply, I am to say that upon the facts stated in your letter the Government of India are disposed to agree that the suppression of the manufacture of earth-salt in Mysore is not at present desirable. His Excellency in Council also accepts your opinion that there is no objection to the export of earth-salt from Mysore into British territory being prohibited, and understands that you are prepared to insist upon the proper enforcement of the orders which have been already issued to this end. But although it may be inexpedient to suppress the existing manufacture of earth-salt, there does not appear to be any reason for permitting its further extension, and any material increase of the production might of course be very detrimental to the Imperial revenue. I am therefore to request that unless you see any serious objection, a list may be prepared of all existing salt-pans, and that your orders in regard to the prohibition of export be supplemented by instructions forbidding the opening of any pans in villages where none exist at present and the opening of any new pans in villages where earth-salt is now manufactured. Unless you can propose any arrangement which can be counted upon for effectively and permanently restricting the extension of these works, His Excellency the Governor General in Council doubts whether, judging from experience elsewhere, it may not—

but save trouble in the end to discourage and gradually suppress the local works.

No. 9931-59, of Bangalore, 20th January, '74.

Order thereon;—

The Chief Commissioner directs that in accordance with the intentions of the Government of India as expressed in their letter above read, measures be at once taken by the Deputy Commissioners of Districts to prevent the extension of the manufacture of earth-salt in the Province. To this end, it will be requisite to obtain a carefully prepared register of all salt-pans now in existence and to issue orders to the Taluk and Village Officers as well as to the occupants of all lands on which such pans are situated, or which are capable of being used for the production of earth-salt, interdicting the opening of any new pans in villages where the manufacture is now carried on, except it be in substitution of pans already in existence and which may fall into disrepair.

2. The number of existing pans having been previously registered, as directed above, the Deputy Commissioners will prepare and submit in the accompanying form a statement showing for each village, both Sarkar and Inam, the following particulars;—

(1). The quantity of earth-salt produ
year (1878-79) in maunds of 24 lb.
(2). The saleable value per maund, and
(3). The rate and amount of tax levied thereon
by Government, whether individually or by con-tract.

3. In submitting these statements through the Commissioners of Divisions, the Deputy Commissioners are requested to state what measures they would propose for restricting the extension of salt manufacture in an effective manner, and whether the present tax can be raised to such extent as to prevent its manufacture for the purpose of illicit export, with reference to the local price of imported sea-salt.

4. As already directed in this office circula order No. 1588-R. 33, dated 21st September last, the District Officers have been desired to enforce strictly the prohibition against exportation of earth-salt from the province into Her Majesty's Territories adjoining, contained in para 2 of the Chief Commissioner's Notification No. 287, dated 6th February '74. The Dep Commissioners are requested to ascertain and report whether there is reason to believe that in any particular localities this injunction has been evaded, in view, if necessary, to the —

e, penalties prescribed by that Notification being
ade more stringent.

Sd/ T. Clarke
Secretary.

To,

The Commissioners of Divisions.
Deputy Commissioners of Districts.
Survey and Settlement Commissioner.
Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

Copd. D.J.

## *Proceedings of the [illegible] enue Department, (Revenue),—dated 28th February 1880.*

**Read—**

Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 8936—59, dated 20th January 1879, calling for certain information in regard to the manufacture of earth-salt in Mysore.

The following replies received to the above Proceedings:—

Letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, No. 72, dated 28th April 1879.
„ from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, No. 485—317, dated 13th June 1879.
„ from do Túmkúr District, No. 87, dated 25th April 1879.
„ from the Commissioner, Ashtagram Division, No. 214—77, dated 14th August 1879.
„ from do No. 267—84, dated 26th do.
„ from the Commissioner, Nagar Division, No. 222—69, dated 27th June 1879.

---

### No. 6386-94—Rev. 1114, dated Mysore, 28th February 1880.

Order thereon.—The Chief Commissioner has had under his consideration the replies received from the several Districts to Proceedings No. 8936—59 of the 20th January 1879, in regard to the manufacture of earth-salt, and, with reference to the orders of the Government of India, resolves to issue the following instructions on the subject:—

(I.) The system of farming out the manufacture should be at once discontinued.

(II.) Licenses for the manufacture should be taken out from the Deputy Commissioners for each pan, such licenses being given only for the existing pans, or pans which may be opened in substitution of others already in existence and which may fall into disrepair.

(III.) Duty should be levied on each pan so licensed at rates which should be fixed by the Deputy Commissioners with reference to the productiveness of the locality, but it should not be less than 3 rupees per pan per annum in any case. The land assessment on arable lands used for the manufacture of the salt should be paid irrespective of the above duty.

(IV.) The export of earth-salt beyond the limits of the Province is prohibited.

2. The sanction of the Government of India has been applied for for extending the penalties provided in Notification No. 287 of the 6th February 1874, to the export of the salt beyond the Province generally, as well as to the unauthorized manufacture of the article without license.

C. RANGACHARLU,
*Revenue Secretary.*

---

To—The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.
„ Deputy Accountant General.

1880.

# GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

---

### REVENUE.

---

The Deputy Commissioners of Districts,
" Deputy Accountant General.

*Dated 28th February.*

*Despatched*

*Received*

No. 6386-
R. 11

B

---

*Earth-salt Manufacture.*—Issues instructions relative to the discontinuance of the system of farming, the issue instead of licenses for the working of pans, the duty leviable thereon, and the prohibition of export beyond the limits of the Province.

---

Mysore Govt. Press, Bangalore.—3-3-80—60.

## OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. Embezzlement of Salt license fees in the Kolar Taluk &c during the period of 6 years ending 1889-90.

LAST REFERENCE. Letter No. 553 dated 31.7.92
119 12.8.92
from ~~the~~ Dy Commissioner, Kolar Taluk.

150
89
239

No 1004/263 dated 5/9 July 1891.

The Dy Commr Kolar District reported to Govt that an examination of the accounts in the Kolar Taluk had disclosed a series of defalcations by Taluk officials of Govt money collected on account of salt pans in that Taluk and that the fraud was not confined to a single year but appeared to have been practised systematically for a number of years since the introduction of the tender system for disposing of salt pans, and that a most searching enquiry accompanied by a close examination of the accounts had been in progress and the result would be reported in detail as soon as the same was completed.

2. The Dy Commr was called upon to report who the officials were that were used to receive and dispose of the tenders for salt pans, by whom the money had been misappropriated &c; and as the fact that officials had drawn with impunity money held in deposit in Govt Treasury on receipts in the names of fictitious persons, and that in order to conceal their fraud they transferred without authority collections from one head to another was a serious matter and betrayed gross carelessness on the part of the Amildar and Taluk Sheristedar of the day, they should be called upon to submit their explanations which should be submitted to Govt with his opinion thereon

Govt order No 5380 dated 3-8-91.

No $\frac{2}{1}$ dated 7.7.92.

3. The Dy Commr. Kolar Dist reported that Head Gumasta Sreenivasaraghavachar had been found to have misappropriated and otherwise defrauded the Govt. of Salt Revenue to the extent of Rs 700 odd while employed in the Kolar Taluk, that he had been dismissed the service and called upon to make good the loss caused by him and that Sheristedar Subba Row had most culpably allowed Govt. Salt money to the extent of Rs 113-3-9 to be paid away from the Treasury to parties admittedly having no claim whatever to the same and had authorized such payments on fictitious receipts &c and that Subba Row being an old public servant having completed his service

or a retiring pension, he had retired him from service subject to Confirmation by Govt. and had called upon the said Subba Row to pay the amount unauthorizedly disbursed by him from the Treasury.

4. The Dy Commr. was informed that Govt. considered that both the Head Gumasta and the Sheristedar ought to be prosecuted if there were sufficient grounds for doing so. and was called upon to make a full report and submit the necessary papers for the orders of Govt. pending which the Sheristedar should be suspended. Govt. order No $\frac{853}{R.F.59\cdot92}$ dated 19/7/92

5. The Deputy Commr. submits copy of his Kanarese order No 123 dated 12th June 1892 to the Amildar, Kolar Taluk, together with a translation thereof purporting No $\frac{553}{119}$ dated $\frac{31\cdot7}{12\cdot8}\cdot92$

to fully explain the various frauds and irregularities committed by the Officials from Tarana (1884·85) to Virodhi (1889-90) and reports that the Amildars and Sheristedars, whose names are noted on the margin who held charge of the Taluk during the aforesaid period are to blame for having through laxity of supervision allowed their Head Gumastas undue latitude which led to various malpractices on the part of these minor officials, who ~~can~~ seem to have acted with unlimited and uncontrolled authority in the Salt Department, and the Taluk having since undergone several changes in its Amildars and Sheristedars

× Amildars.

1. Mr. J. G. North.
2. Madhava Row (acting)
3. T. M. Mir Nizamuddin Ali Khan.
4. Abdul Aziz
5. Hemahanumanthiah.

Sheristedars.

1. Tirumalachar
2. Narainsami Naidu (acting)
3. Suranaranappa
4. Subba Row. ×

[illegible]

it is extremely doubtful whether the respective incumbents of the day will at this distance of time be able to afford a satisfactory explanation of their conduct which gave cause for much confusion the details of which are too varied and complicating to be accounted for by them at the present day. No regular system of booking the transactions connected with the the Salt Revenue appears to have been observed, nor were they checked and scrutinized by the Amildar of or the Sheristadar of the Taluk. The Head Gumastas who were allowed to meddle with the Collections, credited debited or omitted the same in the accounts just as they pleased and the Naggadi

Nagadi officials colluded with them in this respect. The moneys received on account of salt pans were not entered in the village accounts, nor were the collections and remittances made through the village officers as in the case of other items of Govt. revenue.

6. Head Gumasta Sreenivasa-raghavachar has been removed from the service and Sheristadar Subba Rao placed under suspension pending receipt of final orders in his case. Early steps will be adopted to prosecute the Head Gumasta in case he fails to pay up the defalcated amount. If the money is made good such a measure seems unnecessary as he considers the punishment already

awarded by dismissal from service of this long standing Govt servant adequate; but in the case of Sheristedar Subba Row no criminal charge could be sustained as he is guilty of gross negligence and carelessness and that he would abide by the orders of Govt.

7. The following memorandum prepared in this office furnish the particulars connected with the defalcations.

(1) Memorandum A marked in blue pencil. In column 2 the Dy Commrs order (translation) No. 23 to the Kolar Taluk Amildar as far as it relates to charges against Head Gumastah Viraraghavachar and Sheristedar Subba Row is recopied; in column 5 the facts gat[illegible]d [illegible]n the

× Pending Disposal

records, received from the Dy Commr are entered and in Column 4 Head Gumasta Sreenivasaraghavachari's Explanation of his conduct with reference to some of the facts as given in his petition No 433 dated 6-8-86 to this office. The records referred to in Columns 2, 3 and 4 but which have not been received in this Office are noted in Column 5.

(2) Statement B marked in blue pencil is the translation of the Canarese Statement marked I, received from the Dy Commr showing the particulars of amounts of tenders for each pauns during the years Tarana (1884-85), Parthiva (1885-86) and Vyaya (1886-87) which were omitted from the Jamabandi accounts and the amounts of deposits relating to such pauns paid in ens

back or otherwise disbursed from the Treasury to the tenders without due authority and for which Head Gumasta Srinivasaragharachar is responsible.

(3) Statement C marked in blue pencil is the translation of the Dy Commr's Kanarese Statement marked II showing the aggregate amounts of tenders for salt pans, the amounts brought on the Jamabandi accounts and the amounts omitted from the accounts during each of the 6 years ending Virodhi (1889-90)

(4) Statement D marked in blue pencil gives the abstracts of Dy Commr's statements No I referred to in the preceding para and No III exhibiting the Sawar D.C & B on account of salt pans, collections actually credited and those not credited to Govt from Tarana to Virodhi.
(1884-85) (1889-90)

The following is a Summar
with Head Gumasta Seenivasa raghavachari's explanation
placed in juxtaposition of the
irregularities with which he
has been charged and of which
the Dy Commr has found him
guilty and directed him to
pay the sum of Rs 747-13-5
which is estimated to be
the amount of loss sustaine
by Govt under the head
"Salt pans" in the Kolar Taluk during the years
Tarana, Parthiva and Vyaya
1884-85 ———— 1886-87

Tarana. (1884·85).

Please refer to statement D.

As per Tender Register
the total amount (inclusi
of cess of tenders, received
for salt pans was
Rs 2102-15-3. Of this
sum Rs 51-12-9, relates
to pans, regarding which

The Dy Commr asked for information x but which has not yet been submitted.

x. Hd Gumasta's Explanation.

The occupants of the lands on which these pans stood objected to the grant of the pans to others who offered a larger sum. This fact was noted in the Tender Register submitted to the District office. The Dy Commr's order was that if the occupants offered to pay the larger amount the pans might be granted to them, otherwise they should not be granted to anyone and that papers, if any, showing that the lands were granted to ~~osse~~ the aforesaid occupants for salt manufacture should be submitted. No report or papers were submitted because the fact had been already noted in the Tender Register & the Amount relating to the said pans was omitted to be included in the Jamabandi accounts.

2. Rs 163-5-9 is the amount (inclusive of cess), relating to pans applied for, regarding which reports were called for, and owing to the long + delay on the part of the Salt authorities

+ The records show that there was no unusual delay in the correspondence of

the Dy Commr, the Amildar
Shekdars and Shanbhogs.
(Please see para 64 of the
Mr. for more detailed
information).

in submitting such reports the Dy Commr was obliged to order that as the season for the manufacture had expired that year no licenses could be issued, the deposit amounts relating to those pans might be returned to the parties concerned after ascertaining that the said pans had not been worked. Although the Amildar in pursuance of the Dy Commr's order directed the issue of Talkeeds[+] to the Shekdars concerned the Head Gumasta failed to do so and without any ascertainment of the fact above referred to, omitted to include the amounts of these tenders in the Jamabandy accounts and caused the repayment from ~~the~~ Treasury of the amounts held in deposit on account of those pans.

+ H. Gumasta's Explanation
The entries in the Registers clearly shew that Talkeeds and reminders were issued to Shekdars.

3. The sum of Rs 52-15-3 relates to salt pans, regarding which the Dy Commr+ called for information as to whether they were manual ones. They were unobjectionable pans. The Head Gumasta omitted to submit the required information, omitted to include the amounts in the Jamabandi accounts and caused the deposit amounts, relating to those pans refunded from the Treasury.

+ No reply was received from the Shekdar to Takid no 507 dated 21.2.85. A reminder was sent on 28.3.85. In pursuance of the Dy Commr's orders referred to in para 2 above, the sums relating to the pans were omitted to be included in the Jama-bandi accounts & the deposit amounts refunded to parties. There was the salt pan list of 1879, and on comparison therewith, these pans if manual ones, might have been sanctioned

4. The sum of Rs 35-14-+- relates to pans which were sanctioned by the Dy Commr but omitted to be brought on the accounts. The sums held in deposit on account of these pans were paid back to the Tenderers

+ This sum relates to pans situated in two villages: Rs 19.2.. to Harpanhalli & Rs 16.12.. to Coratnagrahar. First, as regards pans in Harpanhalli+ the Amildar made a note in the Tender Register that he would report which of those pans were in occupied lands, but the Dy Commr without paying heed to the note, sanctioned all the pans. In reply to

Takeed, directing the recovery of the balance due from the Tenderer, the Shekdar reported that as the occupants of the lands wherein the pans stood objected to allow the tenderers to remove from their lands Earth for the manufacture of Salt, the tenderer refused to pay up the balance. The tenderer also complained to the Amildar and gave a statement that he could not pay the amount for the aforesaid reason. The Amildar ordered the omission of this item from the Jamabandi accounts and so it was omitted.

Secondly as regards pans in Coortapoorahar. These pans were first applied for by one Marikempegowda for Rs 28 [illegible] of [illegible] (a note was made in the Tender Register that he having refused to take up the pans, his tender was rejected) and Virupayya offered Rs 44. The Dy Commr's order was that if the highest tenderer agreed to pay the full amount the pans might be given him otherwise his statement should be taken and submitted when final orders would issue in the matter. The Dy Commr did not sanction the pans to Virupayya. Notice was issued to Marikempe Gowda on 21.2.85. The next tenderer Virupayya complained of the delay in granting the license and refused to take up the pans and the Amildar passed orders on his petition that the amount might be remitted from the accounts. Records not forthcoming now in the Taluk Kutchery. But it is stated that the Taluk Petition Register shows that Virupaiah complained of the delay on 20-3-85.

5. Rs 10.1.6 relates to pans which were unobjectionable

but orders sanctioning which were inadvertently omitted to be written in the Tender Register by ~~the~~ District office. Head Gumasta took advantage of this omission and +omitted the amount from the Jamabandi accounts and paid back the deposit amounts without making a reference to the District Office to have the omission supplied and without ascertaining that salt had not been manufactured in those pans during the year. The Dy Commr. states that it is impossible to say that the tenderers did not manufacture salt in these pans.

Hd Gumasta's Explanation

+Information was being collected as regards pans on which reports ~~had~~ been called for. The cases relating to these pans were lost sight of in the Taluk Kutchery also

Parthiva (1885-86)

## Parvition (1935-36)

6. As per Tender Register the total amount of tenders inclusive of loss is Rs 1515-9-6. Of this Rs 617-0-9 relates to pans for which deposit amounts are stated not to have been received. Head Gumasta failed to take steps to recover these amounts by otherwise disposing of the pans and the loss thereby caused from the first tenderers. The balance of Rs 898-8-9 is the amount relating to pans which were actually sanctioned, of which only Rs 302-12-4 was brought on the account and the balance of Rs 595-12-5 was ordered to be brought on the account and loss

### Head Gumasta's Explanation

In the arzi which accompanied the list of tenders to the Dy Commr's office it was stated that only such pans had been included in the list of tenders in respect of which deposits had been received from the tenderers. No orders were passed by the Dy Commr in the order sanctioning the aforesaid pans included in the list that steps should be taken to collect deposit amounts from those who had failed to tender them.

On the complaint of some of the tenderers that licences were not issued in due time, the Dy Commr got the records from the Taluk office and ordered in the License Register that in cases where the amounts due for pans had not been received in full, only the amounts held in deposit should be credited to Govt and the balance not collected, care being taken to recover the balance due if it were found that salt ~~the~~ had been manufactured in any of those pans. Under the authority of the orders the amount of Rs 289. 12-4 was omitted to be brought on the accounts. ~~He~~ Shan is that he (Hd. G.) handed over the tender Registers to his successor Subbannah has produced a list of tenders purporting to be signed by the said Subbanna (since deceased) which the Dy Commr pronounces to be a forgery.

to Government — to that extent was caused. The tender Register in which the Head Gumasta states that the Dy Commr had passed orders that in case where deposit amounts alone had been collected from tenderers only those amounts should be credited to Govt and the balance not collected from the tenderers, is not forthcoming in the Taluk office. The Dy Commr presumes that these Registers must have been kept back by the Head Gumasta lest their production would go against him.

Vijaya (1886-87).

7. There was no such omission this year as was noticed in the two preceding years, but steps

were omitted to be taken against the tenderers who failed to make the usual deposit of 25% on the authority of the Dy Commr's order No 672 dated 19.9.87 as pleaded by the Head Gumastah, which the Dy Commr does not accept.

The records show that the Amildar pointed out to the Dy Commr on 13.3.87 that in the Tender Register orders had been passed as regards farms, tenderers wherefor had not paid up the deposit amount and to whom, it was said, notices had been issued, that tenders therefor should be rejected, that Govt would be a loser if according to the terms of the sale notice the loss which accrued to Govt by default on their part were not recovered from the original tenderers & submitted a copy of the notice eliciting orders in the matter.

The Dy Commr asked the Amildar for a copy of the notice on 21.3.87.

The Amildar submitted copy of the notice on 26.5.87 and solicited orders.

The Dy Commr's order dated 19.9.87 directed that tenders of applicants who had failed to pay the deposit amounts should be rejected, the farms being disposed of afresh under the tender system.

Tarana 138-14-9

Parthiva 289.12.5

+ Total 428.11.2.

8. Thus the amount omitted to be brought on the Jamabandi accounts during the years Tarana and Parthiva is Rs 428-11-2 ×

9. The D. C & B under Salt in the Kolar Taluk for the years Tarana, Parthiva and Vyaya stand thus:— (Vide Dy Commr's Statement No III).

| 1 | 2 | | | 3 | | 4 | 5 | | | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Demand including arrears | | | Collections during each year | | Balance | Collections made in 6 years on a/c of Demand for Tarana, Parthiva & Vyaya | | | [illegible] |
| Year | Previous years arrears | Current demand | Total including arrears | As per annual accounts | As per Treasury accounts | (including arrears at the end of each year) | As per annual accounts of 6 years | As per treasury accounts of 6 years | Difference between treasury & annual accounts | |
| Tarana 1884-85 | - - - | 1728 4 6 | 1728 4 6 | 743 3 6 | 743 3 6 | 985 1 - | 1728 4 6 | 1403 6 - | 324 14 6 | |
| Parthiva 1885-86 | 985 1 - | 640 3 3 | 1625 4 3 | 1054 5 6 | 1054 5 6 | 570 14 9<br>499 1 6 | 640 3 3 | 617 5 4 | 22 13 11 | |
| Vyaya 1886-87 | 570 14 9 | 1397 14 7 | 1968 13 4 | 1469 11 10 | 1439 11 10 | 529 1 6 | 1397 14 7 | 1396 6 9 | 1 7 10 | |
| Total | | 3766 6 4 | | 3267 4 10 | 3237 4 10 | 499 1 6 | 3766 6 4 | 3417 2 1 | 349 4 3 | |

10 At the foot of the Dy Commr's Statement No 3 referred to in para 9 above it is stated in Kanarese that out of Collections on account of the years

Tarana, Parthiva and Vijaya the total amount of sums short credited to Treasury is Rs 349-4-3[×], and as this amount relates to the period during which Sreenivasaraghavachar was the Head Gumasta of the Taluk, he has to account for it and the following is the Dy Commr's order thereon:—

"Out of the total amount
"of Rs 349-4-3 not found
"in the accounts deduct
"Rs 30/- due by Ranje Gowda,
"the balance viz Rs 319-4-3
"should be made good by
"Head Gumasta Sreeniva
"saraghavachar in 15 days
"in default, proceedings will
"be adopted to recover the
"same. In default the
"matter should be reported for
orders"

[×] The last figure in Col: 5 of the table in para 9 above.

11. It is not clear how Sreenivasaraghavachar who was the Head Gumasta of the Taluk during the years ~~of~~ Tarana, Parthiva and Vijaya, can be made liable to make good the difference between the total amount of collections shown ~~to have been made~~ in the annual accounts of the × 6 years ending Virodhi as having been made during that period and the total amount actually credited to Treasury during the aforesaid period on account of ~~the~~ demand under Sist for the years Tarana, Parthiva and Vijaya, namely Rs 549-4-3; for ~~the~~ it

× The disparity between the credit given in the annual & the Try: Accts on account of the arrears of demand for Tarana, Parthiva & Vijaya is remarkable in the accounts for Sarvajitu, Sarvadhari & Virodhi
(1887-88) 1888-89 89-90
During these 3 years S. Raghavachar was not Hd Gumasta. (Please see statement attached to St. D).

is clear from the statement that the total collections as per annual accounts of the years Tarana, Parthiva and Vyaya tallied with but a slight difference with those actually credited to the Treasury during those years as shown in column 3 of the table under para 9 above and as recapitulated here below for ready reference:-

| Year | Collections during each year | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | as per Annual accounts | | | as per Treasury accounts | | | Diffce between the two. | | |
| | Rs | a | p | Rs | a | p | Rs | a | p |
| Tarana | 743 | 3 | 6 | 743 | 3 | 6 | .. | .. | .. |
| Parthiva | 1054 | 5 | 6 | 1054 | 5 | 6 | .. | .. | .. |
| Vyaya. | 1469 | 11 | 10 | 1439 | 11 | 10 | +30 | .. | .. |
| Total. | 3267 | 4 | 10 | 3237 | 4 | 10 | +30 | .. | .. |

The Dy Commr. has in his order quoted in para 10 above has deducted the sum of Rs +30 as being

due from one Nanje Gowda.
It is true that arrears due
for Parana, Pottuna &
Vijaya were [illegible] shown as
Collected in the years
Sarvajith, Sarvadhari and
Virodhi in the annual
accounts for those years
without the same having
been credited to the
Treasury. The records
show that ~~he~~ ~~[illegible]~~ Head Gumasta Sreeni-
vasaraghavachar was
transferred from the Kolar
Taluk in September 1887,
and the annual accounts
for the years Sarvajith
Sarvadhari & Virodhi must
have been prepared by his
successor in office.

12. ~~[illegible]~~ Sreenivasa
Raghavachar has petitioned
Govt, representing that he

was removed from service without just cause and that he is not liable to pay the amount of Rs 749-15-5 as ordered by the Dy Commr.

The main question for consideration is whether under the aforesaid circumstances Srinivas Raghavachar should not be prosecuted

The amount for which he should be actually held liable — requires to be ascertained further.

The Dy Comr. has not explained who the Nigadi officials are that colluded with the Hd Gumasta & how they did so. Whether they also should not be prosecuted or held liable is another point for consideration

The Tender Registers, Deposit & Amt accts have not been sent up to check the statements submitted by the Dy Comr. The statements have been taken to be correct.

A 17/12

The Dy Commr Kolar District has found the case Head Gumasta Sreenivasaraghavachary guilty of 5 charges & directed him to make good the sum of Rupees 747-15-5 being the amount of loss sustained by Govt through his negligence and dishonesty.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Charge No 1 | — | Rs 62-15-3 |
| Do 2 | — | 65-14-- |
| Do 3 | — | 10-1-6 |
| Do 4 | — | 289-12-5 |
| Do 5 | — | 319-4-3 |
| Total | | Rs 747-15-5 |

The Charges and the defence are set forth in the llowing Sheets
of Kolar Sheristadar
Sa Rao's case is appended

## Charges against Head Gumasta Sreenivasaraghavachar

In the list of tenders for salt pans for the year Tarana, the Dy Commr called for information as to whether the 8 pans for which an aggregate amount inclusive of local cess of Rs 62-15-3 has been tendered were old ones. These were unobjectionable pans and could have been leased out. The Head Gumasta without the submission of the report called for omitted the amount from the jamabandi and on his own responsibility caused the chouthayi amount held under "deposits" to be refunded from the Treasury. He is therefore liable to make good the loss thereby sustained by Government namely Rs 62-5-3 (Vide para 9(k) of the Dy Commr's order to Kota- [illegible])

Is this true? If so, how can the Hd Gumasta be responsible?

## Head Gumasta Sreenivasaraghavachary's Defence.

The late Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No 6386-16/1114 dated 28th February 1880 lays down that salt shall be manufactured only in the pans which were then in existence and if any of those pans were in disrepair then in an equal no. of pans and that no licenses should be granted for salt pans in excess of that number. These proceedings were based on a list of pans prepared in the Taluka and the District Office and submitted to Government in 1879. If the pans alluded to in the charge were mentioned in the list of 1879 they could have been granted by the Deputy Commissioner & the grant would have been unobjectionable there was nothing to hinder their grant. Though the grant of these pans for Tarana was recommended by the Taluk, × it was not sanctioned in the District Office and the deposit amounts relating thereto were × directed to be paid back to the applicants as the question of [illegible] the 3 pans under reference was included in the correspondence, the applications for those pans were rejected.

With regard to the Dy. Commr's order that he (Sreenivasaraghavachar) having omitted to submit reports in regard those pans and having paid back the deposit amounts without due authority therefor he should be held responsible for the irregularity, he states that he was not a responsible officer and that he was a subordinate and worked under the orders of the Amildar and Shirastedar. The pana-bandy and other accounts have all been signed by the officers in charge of the Taluk from time to time. He prays that his explanation written in his own hand and submitted may be called for and perused when it would be clear that the orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner are illegal

| | |
|---|---|
| The Dy Commr must state whether it is true or not that the lands are situated in Kandayam land & that the holders of the lands refused to allow them to be worked.<br>W.L. | that Virupiah complained on 20th March 1885 that the pans in question had not been sanctioned. |
| 3 The Tender Register for Tarana was returned by the Dy Commr's office to the Taluk office without any orders being passed with reference to certain pans in Tokalgatta for which Rs 10-1-6 was therein shown to have been tendered. - The Head Gumasta took this as an excuse and found left kept out of Jamabandy the aforesaid sum of Rs 10-1-6 and refunded the deposit amount received on account of those pans. The Hd Gumasta failed to point out to the District office the aforesaid omission to have it rectified. It must be concluded that the money was collected and misappropriated | 3. The Dy Commr has passed orders on each and every case separately reported in the Tender Register. Permits (Chits) were issued to tenderers for salt pans which the aforesaid orders sanctioned; and as regards pans in respect of which detailed information was called for Tekeeds were issued to the Shekdars concerned. As the information called for was ~~undergoing~~ yet being collected and no orders had been passed in respect of the pans of the Tokalgatta village, the matter was lost sight of in the ~~village~~ Taluk. It is distinctly enjoined in the Dy |

by the Head Gumasta. Even if he had not done so, he is liable to make good this amount to Govt. as he had assumed unlimited authority in the Salt branch.
(Vide para 11 D)

I don't consider the Hd Gumasta in this matter the Dy Commr is as much to blame as the Hd Gumasta

Commr's orders to the Amildars in Cir No 7 dated 25th April 1884 by which the Tender System was introduced for the disposal of salt pans that the Amildar should himself receive and dispose of the salt pans tenders and that no subordinate official should ~~have~~ be allowed to have any hand in the matter. In the file of correspondence ending with Dy Commr's No 407 dated 6th July 1887 in 7/19 re the complaint of Papiah in the year Parthiva (1885-86) will be found a statement given by the Hd Gumasta and the Taluk Sheristedar Suranaranappa which will clearly shew that the Head Gumasta did not act on his own responsibility in the matter of salt pans but only carried out his superior officer's orders

4. The total amount inclusive of local cess of tenders for Salt pans which were actually sanctioned by the Dy Commr for Parthiva was Rs 798-8-7. The Head Gumasta showed only Rs 508-[illegible]-4 as Jamabandi and improperly left Rs 289-12-5 out of the account. The tender & License Registers for the year Parthiva have been kept back. The Hd Gumasta states that on the complaint of some of the tenderers Dy Commr Mr [illegible] Row enquired into the matter and passed an order in the License Register at the Taluk Kutcherry directing that the amount already received from the successful tenderers on account of their pans and

Sealed tenders for Parthiva were opened by the Amildar who, as he got them read and dated by the then Munshi, tabulated them Hobliwar. The Hd Gumasta did not enter the tenders in the Register. The tabulated lists prepared by the Hd Gumasta are forthcoming in the records and may be called for and examined when they will shew that a sum of Rs 200 has been shewn in excess of the actual aggregate amount of tenders. The tenderers for Tarana complained that as licenses were not issued to them in due time in Tarana as provided in the conditions of the Sale Notice, they found it inconvenient to manufacture salt, and that as rainfall in the year Parthiva was held in deposit, should alone be brought to account and the balance due by them for the said pans should be left out. The Hd Gumasta pleads that he omitted the amount under this order, but he has not produced the said Register or any other documentary evidence in support of his plea. He says that the missing Register and tenders were handed over by him to Subbanna, a deceased Hd Gumasta of the Taluk and has produced a chit purporting to be a receipt obtained from the latter. This is apparently a forged document. It must be presumed that Hd Gumasta has concealed the above mentioned Registers pretending that their production would be inimical to his interests. Evidently less than in the past year and they had sustained loss during the year previous they objected to pay up the amount. There is the Amildar's order that the tenders of those who failed to pay up the deposit amount as per conditions of the sale notice should be rejected and the Amildar had it noted in the tabulated lists above referred to that deposit amounts had not been received.

The Deposit amounts tendered by tenderers of their own accord till the 16th January 1806 were duly entered in the list of tenders and submitted to the Dy Commr's Office. ~~after~~ On receipt of the order sanctioning certain pans, amounts still due by the tenderers for those pans

Evidently this amount has been collected by him and misapplied to make good the sums embezzled by him out of the Fa. [illegible] Collections, the Jamabandy of Parthira being reduced by a corresponding amount. The above sum of Rs 289.12.5 has to be recovered from Head Gumasta Srinivasa raghavachari. (Vide para 15)

were recovered in full as also deposits from tenderers for farms which had not been included in the list and such amounts were brought on the Jamabandy accounts. No orders were passed that steps should be taken to recover deposit amounts from those who had failed to tender them.

On receipt of a complaint that licenses had not been granted to them, the Dy Commr sent for the previous papers, examined them and ordered that the deposit and the tender amounts recovered in full should be brought on the Jamabandy accounts, that no tenderers who had not paid the amount should be allowed to prepare self

The Hd Gumasta's explanation above Parthira is not clear. Does he mean that there were actually no tenders for Rs 898-8-9? Does not the Dy Commr's explanation contain individual particulars?

in the pans, that in future the details showing the situation &c of the pans should be entered in the sale notice and that the past year's balance should be first recovered. The amounts were accordingly entered in that year's Jamabandi accounts

5. Sreenivasaraghavachar was the Head Gumasta of the Kolar Taluk during the years Tarana 1884-85, Parthiva 1885-86 and Vyaya 1886-87. Out of the Collections made on account of the amount shown as demand under kist for those years, the aggregate sum of Rs 319-4-3 (particulars given below) was not remitted to the Treasury. This amount

The statement hereto annexed clearly shows that though the aggregate amount of Rs 319-4-3 relates to the years Tarana, Parthiva and Vyaya, it was collected in the years Sarvajitu, Sarvadhari and Virodhi. The records show that Sreenivasaraghavachar was transferred from the Kolar Taluk in September 1887. Under these circumstances it is not clear should ~~there~~fore be recovered from Head Gumastah Sreenivasaraghavachar and he dismissed from service.

| | |
|---|---|
| Tarana | Rs 294-14-6. |
| Parthiva | 22-13-11 |
| Vijaya | 1-7-10. |
| Total | Rs 319-4-3. |

Please see statement hereto appended (vide paras 25 & 26).

how Sreenivasaraghavachar could have shewn the amount in question in the annual accounts as having been collected and much less held responsible for the amount.

Is it true that the amount was collected, [illegible] in Sarangi, & Vrishi - V.I

Abstract of Kolar Dy. ——— Commr's statement
annual accounts and as per Treasury accounts for the
and the difference between them.

86-8 87-88

| For the year | Demand | | | Collection during Tarana | | | Collection during Parthiva | | | Collection during Vijaya | | | Collection during Sarvajit | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tarana | 1,725 | 4 | 6 | A 743 | 3 | 6 | 792 | 11 | 3 | 126 | 2 | 9 | x 61 | 10 | „ |
| | | | | J 743 | 3 | 6 | 552 | 6 | 9 | 107 | 11 | 9 | „ | „ | „ |
| Diffce + or – | | | | . | | | – 240 | 4 | 6 | – 18 | 7 | „ | – 61 | 10 | „ |
| Parthiva | 646 | 3 | 3 | A „ | „ | „ | 261 | 10 | 3 | 135 | 8 | 4 | x 53 | 6 | 6 |
| | | | | J „ | „ | „ | 501 | 4 | 9 | 121 | 6 | 7 | „ | „ | „ |
| Diffce + or – | | | | | | | + 240 | 4 | 6 | – 14 | 1 | 9 | – 53 | 6 | 6 |
| Vijaya | 1391 | 14 | 7 | A „ | „ | „ | „ | . | . | 1208 | „ | 9 | 178 | 6 | 4 |
| | | | | J „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | 12[illegible] | 9 | 6 | 179 | 13 | 3 |
| Diffce + or – | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . | + 2 | 8 | 9 | +(3)1 | 6 | 1. |
| Sarvajitu | 2152 | 14 | 4 | A „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | . | 163 | 8 | 4 |
| | | | | J „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ |
| Diffce + or – | | | | „ | . | . | „ | . | . | „ | . | . | – 163 | 8 | 4 |
| Sarvadhari | 3780 | 6 | 5 | A „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ |
| | | | | J „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | . |
| Diffce + or – | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Virodhi | 4363 | 1 | 2 | A . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| | | | | J „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ | „ |
| Diffce + or – | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |

Sum total of amounts shown as Collected in the annual accounts

N.B. A. denotes "as per annual accounts
J. Do Do Treasury accounts.

No 3 showing the Salvar demand, and Collection as per

years beginning with Tarana and ending with Virodhi

-89

| ...lection during Sarvadhari | | | Collection during Virodhi | | | Total Collection during the six years ending Virodhi | | | Difference in colln on account of each year's demand between the annual accounts and Treasury figures | | | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| x 4 | 9 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1728 | 4 | 6 | | | | |
| — | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1403 | 6 | .. | | | | Sums marked x, noted below, amounting to Rs 319-4-3, outstanding of Tarana, Parthiva & Vyaya, were recovered in the years Sarvajit, Sarvadhari & Virodhi but not remitted to the Treasury.<br>x. 61-10-0<br>4-9-0<br>53-6-6<br>2-7-1<br>193-3-1<br>5-7-6<br>320-11-2<br>1-6-11 (y) Deduct sum credited in excess of collection<br>Rs 319-4-3. |
| 4 | 9 | .. | | | | - 324 | 14 | 6 | - 324 | 14 | 6 | |
| 193 | 3 | 1 | x 2 | 7 | 1 | 646 | 3 | 3 | | | | |
| — | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 623 | 5 | 4 | | | | |
| 193 | 3 | 1 | - 2 | 7 | 1 | - 22 | 13 | 11 | - 22 | 13 | 11 | |
| 5 | 7 | 6 | .. | .. | .. | 1391 | 14 | 7 | | | | |
| — | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1390 | 6 | 9 | | | | |
| 5 | 7 | 6 | .. | .. | .. | - 1 | 7 | 10 | - 1 | 7 | 10 | |
| 72 | 15 | 2 | 116 | 6 | 10 | 2152 | 14 | 4 | | | | |
| 86 | 6 | 3 | .. | .. | .. | 2086 | 6 | 3 | | | | |
| 3 | 7 | 1 | - 116 | 6 | 10 | - 66 | 8 | 1 | - 66 | 8 | 1 | |
| — | .. | .. | 3780 | 6 | 5 | 3780 | 6 | 5 | | | | |
| — | .. | .. | 3780 | 6 | 5 | 3780 | 6 | 5 | | | | |
| | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| — | .. | .. | 4363 | 1 | 2 | 4363 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| — | .. | .. | 4054 | 1 | 5 | 4054 | 1 | 5 | | | | |
| | .. | .. | - 308 | 15 | 9 | - 308 | 15 | 9 | - 308 | 15 | 9 | |
| ...thout the same being remitted to Treasury | | | | | | | | | 724 | 12 | 1 | |

The following is a summary of the case against Sheristadar Subba Row:-

| | Rs as p |
|---|---|
| Total amount of tenders for the year Sarvadhari as per Tender Register .. | 4201-4-5 |
| Deduct amt. relating to pans for which deposits were not received. | 307-10-3 |
| Balance or the total amount of tenders received | 3893-10-2 |

Instead of Rs 3893-10-2 only Rs 3780-6-5 has been shewn in the annual accounts for Sarvadhari (88-89) which Sheristadar Subba Row has signed; he has as Treasury officer authorized ~~authorized~~ the repayment of the difference of Rs 113-3-9 to unconnected parties on fictitious receipts. The Niyadi accounts shew that the sum of Rs 3893-10-2 was

Subba Row's Explanation.

Papers and accounts relating to Salt pans were being disposed of and prepared under the immediate orders of the Amildar in his room and without his (Sheristadar's) knowledge. The work was very heavy and pressing at the time. Stringent orders for the early submission of the annual accounts were being received from the Dist. office. The Head Gumasta placed the annual account before him and he without checking it signed it believing that all was correct.

He was quite new to the work and to the Taluk. Niyadi Gumasta Ramchandra Rao (since dismissed from service) prepared the receipts in his own hand & initialled them fully recovered. The Dy Commr reports that he has, as per orders of Govt, suspended Subba Rao from service and directed the recovery from him of the sum of Rs 113-3-9, though in his letter No 2/1 dated 7th July 1892 he had reported i.e. retired him from service & recommended him for pension (vide para 18 of G.O. order to Ministry)

Submitted for orders

[illegible]
3/6/93

Recd. 6/6 and [illegible] on 9/6.
[illegible]

[illegible] (Rev) Committee
13/2/

[illegible] statement is unfit for service. W.C.
The amt recovered, no further action called for. W.C.

thinks he saw no reason at the time to suspect the correctness of the endorsement made by the Nagar Jumadar he signed.

Note. The amounts shown as demand & collection for Sarvadhari in the Dy Commr's Statement No 3 are as follows:

| | As per annual account. | As per Treasury accts |
|---|---|---|
| Demand. | 3780-6-5. | " " " |
| Collection. | 3780-6-5. | 3780-6-5. |

There is no record in the file to show that the demand for the year was Rs 3893-10-2 instead of Rs 3780-6-5, which is given in the Annual accounts & the Treasury accounts.

(2) Rs 113-3-9 was paid to 3 persons severally, the first payment being only 10 days after Subba Rao received charge of the taluk, the 2nd and 3rd payments about 7 months after

# Note

I cannot make the head or tail of the case of Srinivasaraghavachary of Tolar. — The charges brought against him are two —

(1) that he did not bring to account certain items which he should have brought to account

& (2) that he embezzled money actually collected. —

It is not at all clear how the Dy Comr has arrived at the conclusion that money collected has been embezzled. — He says that certain sums are shewn in the annual accounts as collected, but the

Treasury accounts do not
show the same — What
are those annual
accounts — who
prepared them & when?
This is not clear —
Srinivasaraghavaiengar
says that the money
was not collected
& that he gave a list
of outstandings, but
he does not explain
why the sum has
been shown in the
annual accounts
as collected. The
whole matter is a
confusion — Unless
the Chief Secy can
prepare a satisfactory
note, from the materials available ~~I would be~~
~~glad~~ of the case should
be remanded for
further report with
instructions to frame

distinct charges against the Head Gumastha, give the grounds of each charge distinctly, & also the explanation of the Hd Gumasta — I can then easily pass orders — As the matter now stands, I cannot ~~say~~ pass any orders

M. J.

27/9/23

To the Chief Secy

✓

Subd - Please see note sub p. 2 marked A - I wd respectfully suggest that a day may be fixed for hearing when the two officers concerned, & the Mr Meerashdar & the Hd Acctt of the District, [illegible]

be asked to attend
also the Taluk
Amildar — This
wd. allow not only
of the particular
case being disposed of
on its merits, but
also of the radical
faults in the system
of working ~~may~~ being
corrected for the future

17/12

I agree. ask the Dy Commr
to send up the parties
punished, with some
officer of his office who
knows all about the matter — with all papers.
I do not yet clearly
understand the charges —
you may fix some
date after our return
from tour. —
18/12/93

# Before the Government of Mysore.

Petn ~~Appeal~~ No. 403 of 1892-93.

Petitioner
~~Appellant.~~ ~~Vs.~~ ~~Respondent.~~

Srinivasaraghavachar
Late Head Gumasta
Chintamani Taluk

Appeal against the order regarding his dismissal in connection with the embezzlement of Salt License Fees in the Kolar Taluk.

(Vide list of papers attached)

నంబరు
1827.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 93వ

[illegible] 23వ [illegible]

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 10వ [illegible] 23 [illegible] 1894వ [illegible]

[illegible]

"By order"

Chief Secretary

Sir,

The file is of the Revenue Branch.

I was told by Dr. Papa[illegible] Goodlyar some days back that the file was with the [illegible] Secretary. It has not since been re[illegible] in the Political Branch.

17/8/94

transferred to Pol. Br.

thereafter the file is [illegible]

17/8/94

[illegible] transferred to [illegible]

The branch [illegible] dealing with the file is [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Schiller[illegible]

[illegible]

25ten [illegible]

[illegible]

Ergebenst

Frankl

Rev. File no 59 of 1892

## Office note

In re Embezzlement of salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk -

Last reference:- Kolar Deputy Commissioner's letter No 1457/366 dated 16th Sep: 895
Sept 16 Oct: 895

No 1094/263 dated 8th July 1891

In July 1891 the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District reported to Government that an examination of the accounts in the Kolar Taluk had disclosed a series of defalcations by officials, of Government money collected on account of salt pans in that Taluk; that the fraud was not confined to a single year but had been practised systematically for a number of years since the introduction of the Tender System for the disposal of salt pans. He further reported that the Taluk officials of the Revenue and the Treasury branches had drawn money held in deposit from Government Treasury in the names of fictitious persons and to conceal the fraud had transferred collections from one head of Revenue to another as they chose, that a most searching enquiry into the case had been set on foot and that he would soon ~~submit~~ report the result of it.

2 The Government thereupon ordered the Deputy Commr to submit a detailed report as to who the officials were that were receiving and disposing of the Tenders for salt pans who had misappropriated the money and whether the fees leviable for licenses for salt pans had not been included in the Jamabandi accounts. The Deputy Commr was also directed to submit a report of the individual

Procgs No. 5380/156
dated 3rd Augt 91
Paper no. 2

No 2/1 dated —th April 802
Paper No. 7

Cases of Officials of the Revenue and the Treasury branches who without having any Connection with the collection work, were nevertheless allowed to receive monies and had thus the opportunity for misappropriating the same -

3. In reply to the above, the Deputy Commr report-ed that Head Gumasta Sreenivasa Raghavachar was found to have misappropriated and otherwise defrauded the Govt to the extent of about Rs 70 while Employed in the Kolar Taluk, that he had been therefore dismissed from Service and called upon to make good the loss he had caused to Govt, that Sheristedar Subba Row who was in the Kolar Taluk during a part of the period of defalcation had most culpably allowed Govt salt money to the extent of Rs 113.3.9 to be paid from the Treasury to parties admittedly having

no claim whatever to the same and had authorized such payments on fictitious receipts, that he had betrayed gross neglect of duty as Sheristedar in not properly checking and scrutinizing the Treasury and Revenue accounts, that the Sheristedar had completed his service for a retiring pension, and that he (Depy Commr) [illegible] [illegible] had retired the Sheristedar from service subject to confirmation by Govt and had also called upon him to pay the amount unauthorizedly disbursed by him from the Treasury. The Deputy Commissioner promised to submit a detailed account of the fraud and irregularities practised by Sreenivasa Raghavachari above named.

4. In August 1892 Sreenivasa Raghavachar appealed to Government against the order of dismissal passed by the Deputy Commr.

Petn no. 403 d/ 6-8-92

5. In his appeal petition Sreenivasa Raghavachari stated he was innocent and prayed that he might be ~~reappointed~~ re-instated.

x
No. 853 / R. 7. 59-92 d 19-7-92
P. no. 8

6. In reply to the above letter dated 7th July 1892 of the Deputy Commr, the Govt ordered that Sreenivasa Raghavachar Head Gumasta and the Sheristedar ought to be prosecuted if there were sufficient grounds for doing so, that the Deputy Commr should make a full report and submit the necessary papers for the orders of Govt and that pending final orders the Sheristedar should be suspended.

No. 553/11a d 31-7-92
F. No. 10

7. The Deputy Commr thereupon reported as follows:

"... the marginally noted Amildars who held charge of the Taluk during the period (1884-85 up to 1889-90) and the Sheristedars are to blame for

x Amildars

1 Mr J. G. North.
2 Madhava Rao acting
3. T. M. Meer Nizamudeen Ali Khan
4 Abdul Aziz
5 Hema Hanumanthappa

Sheristedars

1 Tirumalachar
2 Narayanasami Naidu
3 Songanarnappa
4 Subba Rao

having through laxity
of supervision allowed
their Head gumastas
undue latitude which
led to various malpractices
on the part of these minor
officials who seem to have
acted with unlimited
and uncontrolled authority
in the Salt Department,
and the Taluk having
since undergone several
changes in its Amildars
and Sheristedars it is
extremely doubtful whether
the respective incumbents
of the day will, at this
distance of time, be able
to afford a satisfactory
explanation of their conduct
which gave cause for much
confusion the details of which
. . . . are too much varied
and complicating to be
accounted for by them
at the present day.

3" No regular system of
booking the transactions
connected with the Salt
revenue appears to have
been observed, nor were

they checked and scruti-nized by the Amildar or Sheristedar of the Taluk. The Head gumastas who were allowed to meddle with the collections, credit debited or omitted the same in the accounts just as they pleased and the Niyadi officials colluded with them in this respect.

4" ~~monopoly system~~ The moneys received on account of salt pans were not credited in the village accounts nor were the collections and remittances made through the village officers as in the case of other items of Govt. revenue

× ×

6 " Head gumasta Sree nivasa Raghavachar has been removed from the service and Sheristedar Subba Row placed under suspension pending receipt of final orders in his case -

7" Early steps will be adopted to prosecute the Head gumasta in case he fails to pay up the defalca-ted amount: if the money is made good such a measure seems unnecessary as I consider the punishment already awarded by dismissal from service of this long-standing Govt. servant adequate; but in the case of Subba Row Sheristedar no criminal charge could be sustained as he is guilty of gross negligence and carelessness. However shall abide by the orders of Govt."

8. ~~In September~~ About May 1893 the Chief Secretary submitted the file x to the Hon'ble Mr. P. Chentsal Row Pantulu Garu Revenue Councillor.

x with Office Note and Statements marked A, B, C in blue pencil prepared in the Revenue Department

The Revenue Councillor after going through the papers (and recording remarks in the Statements No. 1 and 2) ~~did not pass any order in the case. He merely observed~~ returned the file to the office with the following order: — : "The whole matter is a confusion. Unless the Chief Secretary can prepare a satisfactory note from the material available, the case should be remanded for further report with instructions

vide Councillor's note of 27.9.93

to frame distinct charg
against the Head gumasta
give the grounds of
Each charge distinctly
and also the Explanation
of the Head Gumasta".

9. On the 17th Decr 1893 the Chief Secretary re-submitted the file to the Rev. Councillor with the note ⊗ marked A. In re-submitting the papers the Chief Secretary suggested to the Rev. Councillor that a day might be fixed for hearing the case when the two officials concerned and the Rev. Sheristedar or the Head accountant of the district office might be asked to attend and also the Taluk Amildar as it would allow not only of the particular case being disposed of on its merits but also of the radical faults in the system of working being corrected for the future.

⊗ The note gives the several charges against the H? Gumasta and his defence.

The Revenue Councillor accordingly ordered a date to be fixed for the hearing.

10. The Deputy Commr. was requested to direct some officer of his office who knew all about the case, and Subba Row & Sreenivasaraghavachar above named to appear before the Honble P. Chentsal Row Pantalu Garu C.I.E. at 3 P.M. on the 15th February 1894 at Bangalore —

No. 10931/Pet. 1007 d/ 11-1-1894
No. 1245/Pet. 170 d/ 26-1-94

Prod. as Nos. 11 and 12

11. On the 3rd February 1894 the Deputy Commr. reported to Govt. that he had directed Hema Hanumantappa Amildar of the Kolar Taluk to appear before the Honble P. Chentsal Row Pantalu Garu on the 15th Feb. 1894 and requested that the said Amildar might be furnished with the necessary references to enable him to study the case and prepare himself

D. no 2644/611 d/ 3.2.94.
P. no. 13

to answer the questions that he might be asked at the hearing of the Case

12. The ×Amildar was accordingly furnished with the necessary references. But before the date of hearing the Deputy Commr requested× the retransmission of all the records and the adjournment of the Case for a fortnight to enable him to submit an explanatory memo.

13. The records were returned and the adjournment also granted.

14. The Deputy Commr was not able to submit the explanatory memo as promised because Sreenivasa Raghavachar had failed to appear before him and explain certain matters.

15. In the meantime Sreenivasa Raghavachar presented a petition praying for early orders in his case. In reply he was informed by Endorse×ment that unless he appeared before the Deputy Commr and gave his explanation his appeal would not be heard by Govt.

Several ×reminders ⊗ were× sent to the Deputy Commr for submission of the report promised –

× Vide Telegram & letter of 13th Feb 94 from the Deputy Commr.

P. ..... 15

× Sreenivasa Raghavachar & Sheristedar Subba Rao × have been addressing petitions to Govt.

The former has addressed about 9 & the latter 4 petns. ~~which are pending.~~

× No 3492 of 4-9-94

P. 16

⊗ No 142 of 15-5-94
3083/P275 of 22-8-94
2993 27-8-94
3042/P367 of 5-9-94
9234/P912 of 6-12-94

× P. no. 20

16. On the 10th Decr 1894 × the Deputy Commr report-ed that Sreenivasa Raghavachar had appeared before him and answered certain questions though very imperfectly and evasively but when he had yet to answer some more questions, he left the station abruptly and that unless he came back and furnished the particulars which were not ascertainable from any of the records left by him in the Kutchery, it was not possible to submit a complete report to Govt in the matter.

17. In ~~Feb~~ Jany 1895 the Deputy Commr was directed to submit his report on such information as was available, in case Sreenivasa Raghavachar failed to appear before him -

18. The Deputy Commr now submits a calendar ⊙ & his following report:-

⊙ Calendar of charges against Sreenivasa Raghavachar.

Enclosure to P no. 25

" Sreenivasa × Raghavachar × persistently failed to appear before me for a searching examination . . . . and the enclosed calendar had therefore to be prepared on the available information as directed in the Chief Secretary's docket

docket No 12296/Pet #26 dated the 25th January 1895 which is a reply to this office reference on the subject.

Letter No 1057/366 dated 16th Sept: 95 from the Deputy Commr of Kolar.

⊕ The names of Amildars are given above.

2 The Amildars⊕ who held charge of the Taluk during the period of embezzlement . . . . have no doubt betrayed gross negligence and laid themselves widely open to blame by allowing their minor officials undue and uncontrolled latitude in matters to which they should have paid their personal attention, but that circumstance cannot in any way extenuate the guilt of the appellant who signally betrayed the trust reposed in him rightly or wrongly by his official superiors and as a public servant disgracefully failed to discharge honestly and faithfully the duties entrusted to or assumed

by him

× ×

Subba Row Sheristedar of the Sidlaghutta Taluk who was ordered by me to retire under the circumstances explained in my letter No. $\frac{2\frac{1}{2}}{1\frac{1}{2}}$ dated 7th July 1892 was subsequently placed under suspension pending the disposal of this case in accordance with the instructions conveyed in Govt. Procgs No. $\frac{853}{R.7\ 59-92}$ dated the 19th instant."

19. The Calendar now submitted by the Deputy Commr. Contains [illegible] the several charges against the Head gumasta, the Deputy Commr's orders in regard to those charges, the Head gumasta's explanation as contained in the statement presented by him, and the Deputy Commrs remarks.

Nhr 24.10.95

Subd. for orders. 25/10

Issued to 2nd Counsellor 27-10-95

20. I have read the whole of
these papers and have no
hesitation whatever in
saying that Sheristadar
Subbarow has been harshly
and inconsiderately treated
in this matter. His case
is the more painful in
that he has had to wait
unnecessarily for a number
of years though there is an
order recorded by the Hon'ble Mr
Pantulu J[illegible] Chentsal Rao as per margin years ago

"The Taluq Sheristadar [illegible]
from service - He be
removed no further
notice is called for"

and disposing
of his case -
No effect has
been given
to this order
and the poor man has
been waiting as a suspended
official - The
irregularity which has
been attributed to him
that he signed the Taluq

annual accounts without scrutiny & that he thereby facilitated the perpetration of frauds & other irregularities by the Taluq Head Goomasta & Nafadi Goomasta both of whom have been dismissed ~~[illegible]~~ though an appeal ~~from~~ by the former however is yet pending – But the gravity of this neglect will be much mitigated when it is borne in mind that Subadar had but recently been transferred from his appt as a Taluq SH Mahalcapur to an office in the Chutcherry. He confesses to having trusted the Head Goomasta & he has suffered out of all proportion for it. Another irregularity of which he has been found guilty is that he refunded moneys in deposit to wrong persons – This he has admitted in a straightforward manner and pleaded inadvertence ~~admitted~~. He attempted no defence & paid

9

113-3-9

up the amount of
which he thus wrongly paid.
The transactions referred to a
period when he had not joined
the Taluq and it is difficult
to detect any gross negligence
of in the matter of this reliance
the Sheristedar was allowed
himself to be guided by the
statements verifications, &
identifications of the Head &
Nagadi Formaslas. If he ~~he~~
did not act as carefully as
he ought to have done he
has been punished more
than adequately for it but
I am bound to say that ~~the~~
his honour is unsullied
and that his good character
which has been testified
to in excellent terms by all his Superior
officers remains quite
honourable - If ~~he~~
in the course of this Enquiry
he had not outgrown the
limit of ~~fifty~~ fifty five years
( ~~he~~ the date of his birth being

12th April 1839) and the Mr Chentral Pundit Sami rao had not already declared him unfit for further service I should have reinstated him in his appt. ~~But such an order will necessarily~~ His suspension will be withdrawn and his retirement from the service sanctioned from the date on which he was relieved of his duties. I hope that his pension papers will soon be obtained & sanctioned.

20. His security amount will be returned to him without the least delay—

22. I suppose the appeal of Srinivasa Raghavachari is still pending. If so it will be posted for hearing & notice given to him. The Rev. Shr. of the Kolar Distt. will be present & will be asked to give me such information in this matter as may be required.

1st Novr 1896

2-11-96.

1. Give an endorsement in these terms to Shr. Subbarao. S. D.

Draft [illegible] 13/11

(Office note in contd.) 10

23. Orders as above recorded were communicated to the Dy Commr in Govt Pro: No $\frac{4402}{D.677}$ ⊗ d 17-11-96.

⊗ Enc. 26.

24. With his docket No $\frac{2364}{5180}$ d 15th Decr 1896, the Dy Commr submitted certain additional papers for reference in the appeal case.

25. On hearing the ~~appeal~~ Petr. Srinivasa Raghavachar & the District Revenue Sheristadar Srinivasa Rao, the 2d Councillor passed the following order with reference to the several charges framed against the Petitioner & the remarks of the Dy Commr:—

Order—

These items do not shew that the Head Gumasta is guilty. In the first place it was open to the District authorities to have made all the necessary investigation and viewed fina

Charges

(1) The amount of Rs. 62-15-3 was unauthorizedly and improperly omitted by the Head Gumasta from the Jamabandy and the deposits received from the tenderers were repaid to them in cash

| Order | Charges |
|---|---|
| orders once for all. This enquiry was at a late Stage shifted to the Amildar. He took no Steps till the year expired. There is no reason to disbelieve the note by Head Gumasta that enquiries had been ordered to be made by Shekdars. In the mean while order no. 187 was received and acting under the authority of that order Steps were taken to adjust the deposits. The debit order of the deposits is signed by Amildar Mr North. It is unfair to hold a minor official such as the Petr liable for all the omissions of his Superiors. No fraud can be imputed to him under this head of the charge. He cannot be made to refund any portion of this amount. | or by credit to other pans tendered by them.<br>Dy Commrs order in regard to the charge.-<br>The Dy Commrs orders in the tender register called for a report as to whether the pans were manual ones and reserved the final decision in these cases pending the receipt of such report. Though these were unobjectionable pans, the Hd Gumasta has unauthorizedly and without the submission of the required report omitted the amount thereof from Jamabandy and has on his own responsibility caused the Kontayi amounts held in deposit to be refunded from the Treasury. He is therefore liable to make good the sum of Rs. 62-10-3. |
| (2). The order of the Dy Commr sanctioning these pans is of 29th Jany 1895. In an order of the Taluk to the Shekdar of 21st Feb: 1895, the Amildar, refers | II. The order passed by the Dy Commr in the register of tenders has distinctly sanctioned the two pans tendered for, at Halgenhalli by - |

## Charges.

Kolar Virupaiya. The amount of these pans (17-12-0) has been left out of jamabandy by the Head Gumasta without authority. Out of the deposit of Rs. 4-8-0 received from the tenderer on account of the said pans, Rs 4-0-0 which was first credited by the Hd Gumasta to the above named village has since been improperly transferred to the credit due to Virupaiya in respect of his pans in other villages. The balance of annas 8 has also been credited towards other pans.

By Commr's order —

As explained in col. 5, there are good grounds to believe that the amount tendered for these pans has been collected and misappropriated by the Hd Gumasta, or the amount has been lost by Govt thro' his irregularity and omission and he is therefore liable to make good the loss. The Hd Gumasta's plea that the omission of the amount from the accounts was due to the objection raised to the effect that the pans were

## Orders

to another order communicating the list of Sanctions and in respect of this village enquires whether the landholders agree to take up the pans for what has been tendered by others. Shekdar replies that Tari (wet) landholders object to give santh. Evidently therefore this objection does not apply to Virupaiya as two salt-pans. In the Darkhast of Virupaiya he asks for five pans which had been worked in the previous year. They cannot refer to the pans about which there was any objection. It is also evident that there were 8 pans in this village, three of which were not given to anyone. The Diary enclosure of No 30 does not specify the rejection of Virupaiya as referring to this village. It is said that Virupaiya had no other pans in that Hobli. In the Statement of Sanctions d 29th Jany 1885, the Dy Commr refuses to grant pans on Kandayam lands.

### Order

This gives rise to the inference that in the case of Halgunahalli, any exception would not have been made. Why was a report sent that all the demands on account of the sanctioned pans had been collected? The omission to the exclusion of two pans in Halgunhally is not referred to in the Amildar's final report. Though these facts raise a presumption that the two pans referred to were not on the Kandayam lands, yet it is not incompatible with the conclusion that they might have been worked with the consent of the landholders in the previous year and that they are not therefore necessarily those situated on unoccupied lands. The omission, it is true, has not been adequately explained, but Srinivas Raghavachar complains that he has not had access to several records. Some registers and other papers are admitted to be missing?

### Charges.

on a Kandayam land is unfounded and cannot be accepted. He had no authority whatever to leave out the sanctioned pans

Under these Circumstances, it is impossible to hold that there is any fraud involved in this transaction. On the other hand, the money has been accounted for by having been credited to other items. Considering the laxity which prevailed in the Taluk in connection with this matter, I refuse to make the Petr a scapegoat and sacrifice him for the neglect of other more responsible officials. No fraud is established against him and he has not rendered himself liable to be punished on this account.

III charge.

The original tender register of Sugatur Hobli is reported to be missing. From the notes written by the Hd. Gumasta in the ~~office~~ copy retained at the Taluk Catchery it is clear that these farms were granted to Ningaiya. The amount tendered therefor (46-12-0) has been improperly left out of the accounts by the Hd. Gumasta,

(3) The Dy. Commr's arguments are very strained and to my mind appear to be wrongly directed. Sreenivasaiyengar is a suspected and dismissed official and yet he has been found fault with for not finding & producing [illegible], which ought to have been

in the Talati order Record. The money referred to has not been shown to have been misappropriated by him. He has accounted for it by showing credits in favor of the Darkhastdar in connection with other items of his demand. His apparent fault then consists in the omission to include this in the Jamabandi demand account. There is only an ambiguous note recorded by him which the Dy Commr wants to use against him. This is that Manikempe Gowda having tendered and disappeared, Veerapaiya's tender is accepted. The Dy Commr states that this entry refers to his sanction while Sreenivasa Raghavachar contends that it refers to the Amildar's action. I think there is not sufficient support for the Dy Commr's assumption. The words used are quite consistent with

on his own responsibility & the deposit amount otherwise disposed of by him. He is therefore responsible for the loss of the amount.

Ordr 13

the Petitioner's contention & are not opposed to another note which says that a notice was issued to Marikempégowda and as he did not appear, the same was noted in the list. If the notice referred to the payment of the difference on account of the default, it need not have referred again to his non-attendance. The Dy. Commr. could have examined the Shékdar and Marikempe gowda on the point, but he wants to throw the burden & blame on the Petr. This proceedings is opposed to the rules of evidence. The result therefore remains that what might have been made clear was allowed to continue in doubt, and it is not expedient or possible to have this evidence now recorded at this distance of tim

On the whole, the Petitioner

Order

has not been shown to be fraudulent or negligent or in any manner blameworthy in this respect.

(4). If there is neglect on the one part there is inadvertence on the other. The Hd Gumasta cannot be sacrificed for an omission in the district office. There is nothing to show that the salt pan was worked and worked with the help of the Petr as surmised by the Dy Commr, or that any money was collected on that account by him. The Head Gumasta cannot be punished in the matter. If he sinned at all, he sinned in better company and no fraud has been established against him.

IV charge.

Orders sanctioning 2 pans in Vanagal koil have inadvertently been omitted to be written by the District office. Taking this omission as an excuse, the Head Gumasta has left out the amount due (10-1-6) for the said pans. This amount must have been collected and misappropriated by him, or was lost by Govt thro' the irregularity of the Hd Gumasta who had assumed unlimited authority in the Salt branch.

Dy Commr's order —

The pans were unobjectionable and there was nothing to prevent their being granted for the manufacture of earth salt. If the orders sanctioning the pans had been omitted from the tender register, a reference should have been made to the District Office in order to the omission being supplied. He is therefore answerable for this amount.

V. Charge.

The Hd Gumasta has left out of account Rs. 279-12-5 out of the amount of tenures sanctioned for this year Parthiva (1885-86). The Head Gumasta alleges that the then Dy Commr ordered the amount to be left out. If the Dy Commr had ordered as alleged, there was no occasion for the Hd Gumasta writing on the 15th January 1887 at the foot of the District Office order No 987 of 26-1-1886 that all the sanctioned pans had been included in the Jamabandi. His statement is untrustworthy. He must have kept back the tenure register of this year knowing that its production would prove prejudicial to his cause. He states that he gave the register to Head Gumasta Subbanna & has produced a Chit purporting to be a receipt obtained by him from the latter. This is apparently a forgery.

(8) It is useless to write in detail about every item which has been discussed here. I spent more than a week in going thro' the accounts and other papers very minutely, item by item with the Kolar Sec. Sheristadar who was aided by one of his experienced accountants, and in the presence of the Petr. The result of my careful examination was that not a single pie was shown to have been appropriated by the Petitioner. He has accounted for every entry, so far as the papers and references are available. I cannot accept the conclusion of the Dy Commr that the Patti said to have been signed by Ramarao is a forgery. On the whole it seems to me that for the combined irregularities or rather the laxity of supervision

order
in the District office and irregularities in the Taluk Cutcherry, the Actg Gumastan hit upon as the party to be sacrificed. It is clear beyond doubt that the practice has been to include the amount of the collections only as the bulk of the Jamabandi demand. This is the reason of much of what was due in Tarana having been shewn in the year Parthiva, because it was in that year that portions of the money due for Tarana were collected. Similarly those who simply tendered without paying the deposit money and those who paid the deposit money but defaulted in paying the balance of the tendered amount after their tenders were accepted were not included in the demand account. There is no evidence whatever to shew that

He seems to have collected the amount in question and appropriated the same towards the repayment of what he had embezzled out of the Tarana collections reducing the Jamabandi of Parthiva by a corresponding amount. The Hd Gumasta is liable to make good this amount. —

these pans were worked, and if they had been worked it is not easy to see how the Petr., a subordinate Revenue account officer could have influenced the result in one way or another. He denies having had any [illegible] executive or active control in such matters or in the collection of Govt dues. No proof has been adduced to the contrary, and Srinivasa-Raghavachar relies [illegible] upon an order issued from the District office [illegible] that in the management of the salt revenue, the Amildar must devote his personal attention and not leave details to the subordinate officials. It is possible that this order was not very strictly obeyed by Amildars; but their omission does not shift the responsibility to the

order

Shoulders of subordinate officials like the Petitioner. Every deposit received has been accounted for. On the whole I am satisfied that the Petr's punishment has been both harsh and unmerited. The order dismissing him from service will be cancelled, and Petr. Srinivasa Raghavachar will be restored to his appointment at once."

"A short order will do to the effect that after a careful examination of the records and hearing Srinivasa Rao, Distt. Revenue Sheristadar, and the Petr., Govt. have come to the conclusion that no fraud can be brought home to the Petr. He has not been shewn to have misappropriated Govt. money, nor has any culpable negligence or irregularity been established against him.

Order it
The Confusion in which the management of this revenue was found is due to lack of Supervision in the district office and apathy and indifference of the Amildars of the time. It is not possible to take notice of their conduct at this distance of time; but it is no reason why a Subordinate official in the position of the Petitioner should be punished with dismissal for their omissions and irregularities. The order dismissing the Petr is set aside and his immediate restoration to his appointment is directed."

26. Orders as above having been communicated to the Dy Commr in Govt Pro: No. 3562/B.505 d/ 11.10.97, the Dy Commr solicited instructions as to whether the Petr should be reinstated to his appointment of Head Gumasta at

+ Pro. 30

⊗ Pro. 31

Chintamani or elsewhere, or it would be enough to give him an appointment of Rs 30, which he was drawing before his dismissal, the pay of the Head Gumasta being Rs 25 rising to 30 according to the revised scale. The Dy Commr was informed ⊗ P. no. 32 that the Petr should be provided with an appointment of Head Gumasta, which he formerly held, either at Chintamani or elsewhere.

27. It is now reported by the Dy Commr that there being no vacancy of Head Gumasta's post, the Petr has been appointed as Police 3d Munshi on Rs 20/- in the district office, pending the occurrence of a vacancy of Hd Gumasta's post. The Dy Commr submits for orders the petition of Sreenivas Raghavachar praying for disbursement of pay due to him from 1st July 1871

the date of his removal from Service, to 15th Novr 1897 when he was reinstated, under clause 1 of article 135(b) of the Mysore Service Regulations, on the ground that he has been honorably acquitted, of the charges brought against him.

The Secretary has already recorded his opinion to the following effect:—

"If it was an honorable acquittal, full pay is admissible, otherwise such portion as to the appellate authority may seem expedient."

Secretary
Subd Forests.

21/6/98 21/6/98

Subd to Mem / 2 E. Du

The view taken by the 2nd Cr shows that the 2nd Gumasta was honorably acquitted. He may therefore be given full salary under article 135(b) 1 of the Service Regulations.
22/6/98

This may be done.
V. P. Madhavarao
22/6/98.

—28

Letter no. 3448/1013 from the Dy. Commr. Kolar.

Remarks by the Rev. Councillor, E. Dn.

The order passed in the case does not go into the facts and merits of the case. I am therefore unable to pass any order on the application as to back pay. The letter may be filed.

28.5.98

[illegible]

I [illegible] the [illegible]
of [illegible]

Subd Secretary

[illegible]
[illegible]

11
7/6/98

Revised [illegible] E. [illegible]

Please see the [illegible] observations in the Calendar attached.

P.T.O.

9-6-98

Remarks by the Rev. Councillor,
E. Dn.

The Secretary is requested to send up the case with a memo.

10th June 1898

Office
Prepare a memo & submit
[illegible]
11-6-98.

55
44
11/6/98

Note Confirmed
& submitted
21/6/98 [illegible] — Submitted to Secretary

Memo confirmed
& submitted.
[illegible]
21/6/98

3358
11 JUL 91
143

(1)

(General Serial No. 30).

189

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Section
File No 3[illegible]
Serial No

To

The Chief Secy to the
Dewan of
Mysore

Dated 8th
Despatched 9th July
Received

**Enclosures No.**

General No. 1094
No. 263

To the [illegible]

Reports that searching
enquiry is being made
regarding the balance
in the Taluks

[illegible] for
orders

11/7/91

The Dewan has read this
report with regret - Communi
cate the remarks to the
needed [illegible] 2 Aug

Drafted.
3/8/91

132
11-7-91

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District,

1094/263

Dated 8/9 July 1891. (1)

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honor to state through the pressure repeatedly put on the Taluq Authorities in respect of Revenue Collection, all the arrears that could with facility be recovered have been collected and the balance still outstanding relates generally to bad cases in which recourse to coercive processes is indispensable. No pains are spared in thoroughly sifting all cases with a view to a speedy recovery or diminution of the arrears that have long accumulated owing chiefly to failure on the part of the Taluq officers concerned to adopt timely measures in the matter.

2 In the course of a strict scrutiny of the accounts for the accomplishment of this end, it has been found that the balances shown as outstanding in the Taluq accounts cannot in several instances be traced to particular

individuals in the village accounts and a difficulty has thus arisen in the recovery of the arrears.

An examination of the accounts in the Kolar Taluq has disclosed a series of defalcations by officials of Government money collected on account of salt pans in that Taluq and this fraud is not confined to a single year but appears to have been practised systematically for a number of years since the introduction of a tender system for disposing of the pans.

4. It has come to notice that the Taluq minor officials of the Revenue and Treasury Branches who have no connection with the collection work are freely allowed to receive monies paid by the renters on account of the pans and that they credited or misappropriated the collection just as they chose. They have also drawn money held in deposit from Government Treasury in the names of fictitious persons and have, to conceal the fraud, transferred collections from one head of Revenue to another at their will and pleasure without proper authority. In short, the state of things is simply a mass of confusion.

5. A most searching enquiry accompanied

Has there been no [illegible] the administration balance sheets of the Khandee accts comparing the totals with that as per Regr kept in the Taluk Nearly 4 ops. Concerned to – [illegible] the Khandee balances & the Regr. [illegible] It must be very [illegible] in respect of the method of check in force and the nature of the [illegible] [illegible]

What officials?

Were not the pans auctioned for the [illegible] auct.

Who has been & who has been disposing of tenders. D

Internal checks should be exercised with the [illegible] [illegible] D.

What was the authority? Whether the Tahsildar [illegible]?

by a close examination of the accounts is now in progress and the result will be reported in detail as soon as the same is completed.

This report is awaited with much interest & concern

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner

Hon

Serial No.

Read,

Letter No. 10[illegible]/263 dated 8th [illegible], from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

Order No. 5580/156 d/ 9/6-8-[illegible]

In the letter, read above, the Deputy Commissioner brings to notice that, in the course of a scrutiny of the accounts connected with Revenue Collections and arrears still outstanding in the several Taluks in his District, the accounts of the Kolar Taluk had disclosed a series of systematic defalcations perpetrated by officials, of Government money collected on account of Salt-pans, in the said Taluk, for a number of years, since the introduction of the Tender

Tender system for disposing of the pans. But it is not apparent from the Deputy Commissioner's report who the officials were ~~that~~ were receiving and disposing of the Tenders for Salt-pans, by whom ~~the money was defalcated~~ misappropriated, and whether the fees ~~collected~~ leviable ~~from the~~ for licenses for salt pans ~~said item~~ were not included in the Jamabandy account, the Deputy Commissioner will be requested to submit a detailed report elucidating these points, as also the individual cases in ~~which the~~ officials of the Revenue and Treasury Branches, who without having

~~had no~~ any connection with the Collection work, were ~~freely~~ nevertheless allowed to receive monies and had thus ~~allowing them~~ the opportunity for misappropriating the same, together with the Deputy Commissioner's proposals for preventing the recurrence of this in future.

2. It is further ~~observed~~ reported ~~that~~ the officials had drawn with impunity, money held in deposit in Government Treasury, in the names of fictitious persons and ~~that~~ in order to conceal their fraud, they transferred without authority, collections from one head to another. As the matter is serious and betrays gross carelessness on the part of the Amildar and Taluk

Taluk Treasuries for the day [illegible], ~~they~~ will be called upon to submit ~~their~~ explanations wh will ~~and the~~ ~~same~~ be forwarded to Government with the Deputy Commissioner's own opinion ~~thereon~~.

3. ~~It is evident that~~ There has apparently been no system of adding up the balance sheet of the Khirdi account and comparing the ~~total~~ with ~~that~~ as per Register kept in the Taluk Treasury, and of certifying to the Correctness of Khirdi balances. The Deputy Commissioner will submit a very full report of the method of check in vogue; and

and the nature of the discrepancies discovered.

4. The Dewan has read the Deputy Commr's report with regret and awaits the further report with much interest and concern.

Chief Secy.

To.

The Dy Commissioner
Kolar Distt.

1891-92

To the Revenue Secy. 3/1/6 92

The Ch. Commr.

Dt. ~~3~~ 6 August 1891.

No. 5380/156.

[illegible] authentic defalcations perpetrated in offices of Govt. revenue collection made of [illegible] in the Kolar Dt., asking for a detailed report elucidating the ~~of~~ points, and a very full report of the method of check in vogue and the nature of the discrepancies discovered.

Forwd. un[illegible]
Petition No

Begs to advise ~~the~~ that Srinivasa Rao, Head Sheristadar of Kolar Dt., has actively assisted in the misappropriation of Govt. money in the [illegible] Taluk

Submitted for information.
[illegible]
20/1/29

Sec.
File No
Serial No

B[illegible] 1 9 [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

శ్రీరస్తు

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

22·9·89

E 51

(General Serial No. [illegible])

189

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
2287
26 MAY 92
84

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

(4)

Section

File No
To
Serial No

Dated 25th May 1892

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

3010

General No. 2, 0
No.

Referring to the pseudonymous petition regarding the misappropriation of Govt. money in the Bowringpet Taluk and stating that he has already reported to Govt. of certain irregularities in the Kolar Taluk regarding Salt revenue.

Original papers on file. Recd. Reg.r for Report in matter No. 2 called for [illegible] as Augt. 1891

27/5

[illegible] 27/5

[illegible]

---

Chief Secy's order

1. Is there any report before Govt. regarding the large Embezzlements in Bowringpet Taluk?
2. Put up file relating to embezzlement of salt licence fees in Kolar Taluk.

26/5/92

---

1. No.
2. Papers sub[illegible]ttach

A
30-5-92

4 25/5/92
[illegible]

(1)

My dear Sir:

In [illegible]
[illegible] the accompanying
petition [illegible],
with your [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
the allegations [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] unfounded.
[illegible]

[illegible] to let,
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
in this direction,
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible]
to you

[illegible]
the petition
[illegible]
I think that at
the production
[illegible] of the [illegible]
the [illegible].

I ascertained from
the [illegible]
Auditor that out
of the amount $40
1,000 to be accounted
for $37,000 have
been traced, about
$3000 [illegible]
was appropriated
by some of the
Commissioners and
the remainder
having been written
off these accounts

as uncollectable
without authority
on the bare order
of the [illegible]
[illegible] especially
Mr. [illegible]
[illegible] I am confident
that the remaining
$3000 will be
found and when
the accounts of
the [illegible]
Commissioners are
examined. I
have written to
the [illegible]

Also

1 Is there any report before Govt regarding the large embezzlements in [illegible] Taluk?

2 British file relating to embezzlement of salt revenue fees in Kolar Taluk

26/5

1) I

2) I.

I have already represented to Govt of certain irregularities in the Taluk office regarding salt fines. The Amildar and Revenue Sheristadar were consequently appointed to examine the accounts in a Summary with the result that the Head Gumasta was found guilty

of our appropriating
a sum of $25,000.
So we shall continue
cordially [illegible]
against him for
a [illegible]
of prosecution
having endured
his dismissal
and payment to
him of the [illegible]
[illegible] amount.
Evidently this

[illegible] an
[illegible] his
sympathizers in
the actions of
the petition which
[illegible]
taken to [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
of [illegible]

Yours sincerely
[illegible]

Ex. $\frac{37}{96}$ of 1st June 1892 $\frac{4}{4}$

To

The D.C. Kolar Dt.

Section

File No

Serial No

Sir,

I am directed to draw your attention to Ro. No. $\frac{5380}{56}$ of the 3rd August last, and to state that Government await the report therein called for in connection with the embezzlement of Abkari license fees in the Kolar Taluk.

I have &c.

for Chief Secy.

9/E 51

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

*From*

*The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore*

*To* The Deputy Commr
Kolar Dist

*Dated* 1st June 1892.
*Despatched* 4th June 1892.
*Received*

**Enclosures No.**

*General No.* 3961
*No.* 96

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

Stating that Government await the report called for in August last in the matter of the embezzlement of salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk.

From the Secretariat -52

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892 302

From The Deputy Commissioner [illegible] District K34

17

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated [illegible] 1892

Despatched [illegible]

Received [illegible] 7.

Enclosures No.

General No. 2.

No.

In reply to

Section

File No

Serial No 1/2

## SUBJECT.

Reporting that [illegible] has been retired from the service and submitting certain arrangements for approval.

Remind [illegible]

Rev.

Refer. [illegible]

After disposal of the paper [illegible] Branch [illegible] 11/7/92

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Recd 11-7-92

Submitted

The Dy. Commr. has dealt very leniently with the Head Gumasta and the Sheristedar. Their offences require, I think, a more severe punishment. The Sheristedar having been retired, will be entitled to a pension too!

The appointments reported in para 6 and the transfers mentioned in para 7 may be approved — [illegible] 14/7

Submitted. Considering [illegible] I see no reason apparent why the Gumasta should not be prosecuted and the Sheristedar punished. The Deputy Commr's report is very meagre and [illegible] the reason why [illegible] Respectfully submit all the papers with [illegible] 16 July

If there are suff[icien]t grounds to do so I think both the H[ead] Gum[asta] & the Sher[istedar] be prosecuted. Mr [illegible] may be asked to make a full report & submit the necessary papers for the orders of Govt. The two officers may be suspended pending the further orders of Govt & the arrangements proposed by Dy Commr appd as a temporary measure. [illegible]

18/7/92

Recd [illegible] Draft [illegible] 18/7.

Draft [illegible] 19/7

No. 7 -

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated 4th July 1882

To
The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir

With reference to previous correspondence ending with your letter No 3911 dated the 1st instant I have the honor to state that the report therein called for by Government in connection with the [illegible] amount of Toll Licence fee in the Taluk of Kolar will be submitted shortly.

2. Head Gumasta [illegible] Char was found to have misappropriated and otherwise defrauded the Government of such sums to the extent of Rupees two hundred while employed in the Kolar Taluk. He has been dismissed the service and called upon to make good the loss caused by him.

3. A detailed account of the fraud and irregularities practised by him in the matter will

will be found embodied
in the report which will
follow.

4. Periatamby Sabapathi-
of Pillagatta who was in
the Police Court during a
part of the period of defalcation
has most culpably allowed
Government cash money
to the extent of Rupees 1762-0
to be paid away from the
Treasury to parties admittedly
having no claim whatever to
the same and has authorized
such payments on petitions
received. He has besides betrayed
gross neglect of duty in checking and
in not properly checking and
scrutinizing the Treasury and
Revenue Accounts which would
have in no small degree con-
tributed to the detection and
irregularities discovered during
my enquiry.

5. [illegible] is an old
Public Servant and has completed
his service for a retiring pension.
I have in his case thought it
an adequate punishment
to retire him from the service
and have accordingly done so
subject

subject to confirmation by Government. I have called upon him to pay the amount unauthorizedly disbursed by him from the Treasury.—

6 T. Krishna Iyengar who has been Acting Sheristadar at the Chickballapur Taluk [illegible] vice [illegible] Chandra appointed Deputy Amildar of Sidlaghatta Sub-taluk is a Matriculate and has passed the Examination prescribed for an Amildar. I have subject to approval by Government confirmed him in his present post and promoted him to the 1st grade on Rupees 50 which had become vacant by the retirement of [illegible] and have appointed [illegible] Ramanna Police Inspector Sidlaghatta on Rupees 40 who has also passed the Amildar's test as Sheristadar of the same Taluk Sub-taluk on Rupees [illegible] vice T. Krishna Iyer, promoted.—

7 As the Amildar of Bowring-pet complains of want of co-operation from his Sheristadar [illegible] it is desirable that he should be transferred from that Taluk. I have accordingly subject to Government

of

approval which I wish to
go to [illegible], I have
[illegible] this [illegible]
of the latter Colonel [illegible]
leaving him at [illegible],

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obt. Servant
[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner

Section
File No
Serial No

Read:

Letter No 2 dated 7th July 1892 from the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District, promising to submit the report in connection with the embezzlement of Salt License fees in the Kolar Taluk, and stating that subject to confirmation by Government, he has retired Sooba Row then Sheristadar of the taluk and now Sheristadar of the Sidlaghatta Taluk, & confirmed S. Krishna Iyer as Sheristadar 1st Grade & also appointed Police Inspector D. Shamanna as Sheristadar of the Sidlaghatta Taluk on Rs 40/.

No $\frac{853}{R.759-92}$ D/$\frac{19}{19}$-7-92 Order thereon.

The Government

concedes that both the Head Jemadar & the Sheristadar ought to be prosecuted, if there are sufficient grounds for doing so. The Deputy Commissioner will be requested to make a full report and submit the necessary papers for the orders of Government, pending which, the Sheristadar will be suspended & the arrangements proposed by the Deputy Commissioner approved as a temporary measure.

19 July

Chief Secty.

Draft for [illegible]

× The [illegible]
to say, that the [illegible]
[illegible]
The [illegible]
[illegible]
case of [illegible]
[illegible]
Submitted
[illegible]

H.B.

To The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Section
File No 189
Serial No

(9)

*From*

*The Chief Secretary to the*
*Dewan of Mysore.*

*To*
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

*Dated* 9th August 1892.

*Despatched* 11th

*Received*

**Enclosures No.**

*General No.* [illegible].

R.7 *No.* 59-92

This Office No. 853 R.7 59-92 dated 19th July 1892 requesting to make a full report & to submit necessary papers for the orders of Government towards the prosecution of certain officials in connection with the embezzlement of salt license fees in the Kolar District ~~and subsequent reminder marginally noted~~

---

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request an early reply

" By Order "

9/8

Under-Secretary.

Draft 9/8/92

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore,—27—12—1,000.

(General Serial No. 30.) 1636.

189~~2~~.

R 445

VAN OF

*From*

Section

File No

Serial No

The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

(1)

*To*

The Chief Secy to the Dewan of Mysore

*Dated* 31st July 1892

*Despatched* 1st August 92

*Received*

**Enclosures No.** 5 + 1 file

*General No.* 553

*No.* 119

Reporting on the Embezzlement of the Salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk:—

Vide No 10731/Oct 1007 d 11/1/94.

Memo submitted.

6/6

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Office
Kolar District.

No. $\frac{533}{119}$ Emst. file

Dated the 31st July 1892.
12-8-92

(1)

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

This Office letter No. $\frac{394}{253}$ dated 8th July 1891.
Government Proceedings No. $\frac{5880}{133}$ dated 3rd August 1891.
Chief Secretary's letter No. $\frac{304}{96}$ dated 1st June 1892.
This Office letter No. $\frac{2}{1}$ dated 7th July 1892.

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No. $\frac{853}{R.F.59.92}$ dated the 19th instant and previous correspondence as per margin, regarding the embezzlement of Salt License fees in the Kolar Taluq, I have the honor to submit the accompanying copy of this Office Kanarese Order No. 123 of the 12 ultimo to the Amildar of the Taluk on the subject together with a translation thereof which fully explains the various frauds and irregularities committed by the officials from Tarana (1884-85) to Virodhi (1889-90).

2. It is clear from the same, that the ×

marginally

marginally noted Amildars who held charge of the Taluk during the above period and Sheristedars are to blame for having through laxity of supervision allowed their Head Gumastas undue latitude, which led to various malpractices on the part of these minor officials who seem to have acted with unlimited and uncontrolled authority in the Salt Department, and the Taluk having since undergone several changes in its Amildars and Sheristedars it is extremely doubtful whether the respective incumbents of the day will, at this distance of time be able to afford a satisfactory explanation of their conduct which gave cause for much confusion the details of which as observable from the Enclosures, are too varied and complicating to be accounted for by them at the present day.

3. No regular system of booking the transactions connected with the Salt Revenue appears to have been observed nor were they checked and scrutinized by

Amild

1. Mr J.
2. Madhav
3. T.M. Kir
4. Abdul
5. Hema A

Sheri

1. Perumala
2. Narayan
3. [illegible]
4. [illegible] K

ars
G. N.R.K.
a Rao Acting
Nizamuddin
Ali Khan
Aziz
Hanumantiah
stedars.
ehar.
swami Naidu
Acting
ranappa
o.

by the Amildar or Sheristedar of the Taluq. The Head Gumastas who were allowed to meddle with the collections, credited, debited or omitted the same in the accounts just as they pleased and the Nagadi Officials colluded with them in this respect.

4. The monies received on account of salt pans were not credited in the village accounts nor were the collections and remittances made through the village officers as in the case of other items of Government revenue.

5. With a view to discontinue such objectionable and unsafe practice and to prevent a recurrence of similar irregularities in future, I have already issued circular (Copy enclosed) orders to all the Amildars and Deputy Amildars enjoining strict care on their part to see that monies collected under this head of revenue are invariably credited in the village accounts and that remittances are received through the Shanbogues and Potels.

/ 119 dated 25th June 897.

6. Head Gumasta Srinivasaraghavachar has been removed from the service and Sheristedar Soob Row placed under suspension pending

pending receipt of final orders in his case.

7 Early steps will be adopted to prosecute the Head Gumasta in case he fails to pay up the defalcated amount: if the money is made good such a measure seems unnecessary as I consider the punishment already awarded by dismissal from service of this long standing Government servant, adequate but in the case of Subba Rao Sheristedar no criminal charge could be sustained as he is guilty of gross negligence and carelessness. However, I shall abide by the orders of Government.

8 The Original papers connected with the case as per accompanying Ferist are also herewith submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

H. Moosa

for Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District.

(General Serial No. 32.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Section | J. K. 1892. |
| File No. | |
| No. | 403 |
| Serial No. | |
| Name of Petitioner. | Sreenivasa-Raghavachar. |
| Village. | Chintamani |
| Taluk. | Do. |
| District. | Kolar |
| Date of Arzi. | 6th August |
| Date of Receipt. | 15th August |
| Date of Disposal. | |
| No. of Enclosures. | 3. |

Petitioner should produce a proper copy of the order requiring him to pay Rs. 747 & also dismissing him.
BG
3/9/92

ABSTRACT.

In 1887, Petitioner was tran[s]ferred from Kolar to the Chintamani Taluk and there was doing duty as Headgumasta. In 1889, the Dy Commissioner sent for him and told him to see and understand the accounts of salt-pans ~~fo~~. of the Kolar Taluk for those years in which he had been there. After he did so, the Revenue Shirestedar took down his deposition. The Dy Commr did not settle the matter though Petitioner represented to him often. He hears that in December

The Dy Commr's report on the subject appears to have been recd. in the Rev Branch. Transfer this petn also to that branch for necessary attention.
BG
7/9/92

..., an order was sen the Amildar of Chintaman to ~~take~~ appoint a substitute for Petitioner.

It seems that the Amildar of Kolar reported to the Dy Commissioner that Petitioner which he was at Kolar omitted to enter about Rs 200 in the accounts and that the Dy Commr has reported the same to Govt.

Owing to the false statements of the Amildar and the Revenue Shirastedar, the Dy Commr passed an order n April last that Petitioner hould pay Rs 319-4-3 to Govt.

He hears that in June an order was passed that he should pay Rs 747-15-5 and subsequently another rder dismissing him from service was passed.

Petitioner states that he is quite innocent, and besides it is impossible for him to omit to enter an amount of demand as he is a subordinate official carrying out the orders of the Amildar & the Shirastedar: that it was his successor that misappropriated the amount. He prays that the Dy Commissioner's order may be cancelled and he may be reappointed.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Rupee stamp
K
15/8/92

Regd. [illegible] 15/7

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

403 R.
15-8-92

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2200 [illegible]

[illegible] 319-4-3 [illegible]

[illegible] 7+7-5-5 [illegible]

(General Serial No. 32.)
Section
~~189~~ 93
File No
Serial No. No. 1943

Name of Petitioner. Ibrahim Khan

Village. Kolar
Taluk. Kolar
District. Kolar

Date of Acct. 25-1-93
Date of Receipt. 30-1-93
Date of Disposal.
No. of Enclosures. Nil

Submitted for orders (Please see Petn.).
[illegible]
3/2/93

Orders

Has the Dy. C. reported? If so, send the file. If not, send urgent reminder.
[illegible]

## ABSTRACT.

When the [illegible] authorities in collection [illegible] misappropriated the amount of Rs [illegible] out of the Revenue of the salt pans, the [illegible] was [illegible] & the Gumasta suspended while the [illegible] was promoted.

On another occasion [illegible] the whole [illegible] collection Rs [illegible] [illegible] appropriated Rs 1500 [illegible] the Taluq [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] was [illegible] & [illegible]

9

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

Prays that this may be ta

1-9-92
cov-
agt & Submit^d.

1943 Rs.
30-1-93

శ్రీ [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

୨୩-୮-୧୨

[illegible]

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893 [illegible]

No

Serial No

No. 3039

Name of Petitioner. Subbarow Late Sheristadar

Village. Shidlaghatta Taluk

Taluk.

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 10 · 5 · 93

Date of Receipt. 12 · 5 · 93 ·

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one Service Register

ABSTRACT.

Requesting early favorable orders in re grant of pension to petitioner for his long service in the Mysore State

Where are the papers? (See para [illegible])

Vic 16/5

Refers to the [illegible]

[illegible] 10/6

Submitted.

[illegible] 20/6

[illegible] 20/6

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore 7-9-92, 100

DEPARTMENT.
REGD. No. 3039 R
DATE 17-5-93

File as read

To

[illegible]
14-11-96

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of
Mysore

The humble petition of Soobba Rao late Shirastadar of Siddlaghatta Talook Kolar District.

Respectfully Sheweth

That your petitioner having entered Government Service as Goomasta in 1861 and served in various Capacities was made Naib Shirastadar in 1872 his designation was in 1879 changed into Head moonshi of the general Asst. Commr's office Kolar District.

2 That your petitioner held the above appointment till February 1889 when on the recommendation of the Asst. Commr. Mr. Ramachendra Rao your petitioner was appointed on three months probation as Talook Shirastadar & posted to Kolar Talook against his will as the Change gave him no kind of promotion.

3 That although the petitioner was new to Talook work still he exerted himself to the best of his ability in satisfactorily discharging his duties by personally supervising & scrutinizing all the credit and debit items while so sometime after he assumed charge, Vouchers acknowledging receipts of Rs. 13 and odd, held in deposit on account of fees on salt pans were brought before the petitioner by the Head and Nagady Goomastas. The petitioner on a perusal of the receipt made due enquiries as to what it was. The Head and Nagady Goomastas then told the petitioner that the Vouchers was for the payment of Rupees 113 and odd, which

has been held in deposit and for so continuing since objection had been taken by the higher authorities for keeping it under that head. The petitioner then examined the register himself and found that the register contained the entry as asserted by the Head and Nagadi Goomastas. These two officials again told the petitioner that there was no objection in ordering payment and that so doing was merely following the ordinary course of business. As the Head and Nagadi Goomastas were officials of long service in the Talook and as there was nothing in their behaviour or in the Deposit registers to make one disbelieve their assertions, the humble petitioner in due course of business, ordered payment of the amount.

4 That your petitioner having been new to the work at the time and having relied fully the statements of Head Goomasta who had been deputed by the Amildar to be in sole charge of the accounts connected with the salt pans and that of the Nagadi Goomasta who had checked and certified the vouchers with his signature and further showing to your petitioner an entry in the Deposit Register to the effect that similar payments had on previous occasions been made to some parties the petitioner ordered the above payments to be made in the implicit confidence that he was but discharging his duty and without any apprehension of false play.

5 The humble petitioner was subsequently transferred to Mulbagal Talook and thence to Siddalghatta. Two years after on some complaint against the Head Goomasta that he had embezzled Government money the Talook accounts were duly examined several irregularities on the part of the Head Goomasta having come to light he was tried and convicted criminally. The Nagadi Goomasta was also

dismissed from the service on this occasion it was noticed that the humble petitioner had erred in ordering payment of the Rs. 3 and odd referred to above and directed that the same should be recovered from the petitioner. The same was also deducted from the petitioners salary.

6 That subsequently the Deputy Commissioner sent an order to the Talook that your petitioner should retire from service and that he should send in his pension paper for submission to Government.

7 That when your petitioners papers were submitted to Government with the Deputy Commissioners recommendation for pension the Government called upon the Deputy Commissioner to submit the complete records connected with the case and ordered that your petitioner should be placed under suspension till the Government passed a final order in the matter.

8 That your petitioner attributes to his misfortune that his long and faithful service under Government for a period of 3 years should thus terminate. That your petitioner has served the Government faithfully which can be seen from his Service Register and from other testimonials given to him by several officers under whom your petitioner had the honor of serving.

9 That it is more than ten months since your petitioner has had any pay or pension which is the sole means of your petitioner & his large family maintenance.

10 That your petitioner therefore humbly prays that taking his pitiable case into consideration the Government may be pleased to sanction the pension to which he is entitled as early as possible and thus afford him and his family a means of living.

Humbly soliciting to be pardoned for intruding upon your honor's precious moments and craving the grant of an indulgence, he humbly begs to subscribe

Your most obedient servant

10th May 1893
Bangalore

1893-94

Section
File No
Serial No

To
The Dy Commr.
Kolar District.

Dated October 1893.

No

His letter No $\frac{553}{119}$ dated 31st July 1892 reporting upon the embezzlement of the salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk

---

Has the honor to forward a memo prepared in this office of the case against Head Gumasta Sreenivasaraghavachar reported upon in the above and to request that the same may be returned at an early date with his remarks thereon together with the papers & Registers therein referred to.

1. Shekdar Syed Kasim's report No 990 d/ 9.3.85.
2. Shekdar Venkataramaiah's report No 30 d/ 20.4.85.
3. Sugatur Hobli Shekdar's Form Register for 1884-85.
4. Petition Register for 1884-85 kept in the Taluk
5. Dy Commr's Cir No 77 d/ 25/4/84
6. File of correspondence ending with Dy Commr's order No $\frac{459}{[illegible]}$ d/ 6-1-87 P.T.O.

"By order"

for Chief Secretary

7. List of salt pans in the Kolar Taluk, prepared in 1879.

8. Bidders for salt pans received for the year Parthiva (1885-86.) together with tabulated lists.

9. Explanation submitted by Ag. Gumasta Srinivasa raghavachar.

[illegible] 1827 [illegible]
[illegible]

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 1628

Name of Petitioner. Sreenivasaraghavach
Head Gumasta

Village. Chintamani

Taluk. Do

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 22-12-93

Date of Receipt. 23-12-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil

Section
File No
Serial No

ABSTRACT.

Soliciting early orders on his Appeal, dated 15th August 1892, in re the restoration of his appointment.

23/12.

[illegible]

1628 R
23-12-93

[illegible]

[illegible]

1893 [illegible]

[illegible]

1/2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22-12-93

[illegible]

[illegible]

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

Section
File No
Serial No 1

No. 1827

Name of Petitioner. Sreenivasaiyengar, Head Gumasta of

Village.
Taluk. Chintamani Taluk

District. Kolar

Date of Arri. 23-12-93

Date of Receipt. 10-1-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil

---

ABSTRACT.

Soliciting early orders on his petition appealing against the order of the Deputy Commission of Kolar.

10/1

No order on petition

[illegible]

Committee
mind a
case to be
dealt for
hearing -
[illegible]
[illegible]
issued -
This is the
Case of Gen-
-tlement
appellant
[illegible]
[illegible]
10

[illegible]

[illegible]

23 [illegible]

1827

10-1-94

1893 [illegible] 23 [illegible]

[illegible]

11-1-94

[illegible] 1/2 [illegible]

[illegible] 19 [illegible] 2-3 [illegible]

[illegible]

Section
File No
Serial No

To

The Deputy Commr
Kolar District

Dy $\frac{11-1-94}{11}$

Encl: state.

No $\frac{10731}{Pet: 1007}$

His letter No $\frac{553}{119}$ dated 31st July 1892 reporting on the embezzlement of Salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk

---

With reference to the above has the honour to request that the Dy Commr will be so good as to arrange to send to this office on a date of which intimation will be given hereafter, some officer of his office who knows all about the matter, with all the papers connected with the matter including those specified in the margin -

The parties concerned in the commission should also be

1. Shekdar Syed Kasim's Report No 991 dated 9-3-85
2. Shekdar Venkataramiah's Report No 30 dated 20-4-85
3. Sugatur Hobli Shekdar's Form No 74 Register for 1884-85
4. Petition Register for 1884-85 kept in the Taluk
5. Dy Commr's circ: No - dated 25-4-84
6. File of correspondence ending with Dy Commr's order No $\frac{452}{717}$ dated 6-7-87
7. List of Salt-pans in the Kolar Taluk prepared in 1879

Tenders for salt pans for 1885-86 in tabular

Sent up to this office on the same date.

By order

11/1

Chief Secretary.

11/1

tabulated lists

9. The Money Order Register, the Deposit & Journal a/cs relating to the matters under enquiry.

10. Papers referred to in the Enclosed explanatory statement submitted by the Postmaster Sreeman Raghunathan (to be returned to this office after taking a note of the papers)

Section D

File No

Serial No

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Dt 26th/26 Jany 1914

12115
Pol: 1179

In continuation of this Office No 10731/P.1007 dated the 11th instant has the honor to request that the individuals referred to therein may be directed to appear before Rajamantrapravina the Hon'ble S. Venkata Rao Pantulugaru C.I.E. Councillor to H.H. the Maharaja, at 3 P.M. on the 5th Proximo, at Bangalore.

By order

26/1/1914

Draft

Chief Secretary

(General Serial No. 30.) 12138

1894. Pet 435

Section

File No

Serial No

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 3rd February
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 2644
No. 611

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Informs that Mesra Ramanantayya Amildar of Kolar has been directed to appear before the [illegible] [illegible] Rao garu & c. on the 10th instant at 8 a.m.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

No 2644/611

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated 3rd February 1894.

(1)

To.

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir

Docket No: 10731/Dl. No: 007 dated 18th December 1893
Received on the 13th January 1894.
Docket No 12/1115 / Dl. No. 1170 dated 26th January 1894.

With reference to your dockets as per margin, I have the honour to state that Rama Hanumantayy amildar of the Kolar Taluk, has been directe to appear before Rajamantrapravina, the Honorable P. Chent Rao Pantalu Garu C.I.E. Councillor to His Highness the Maharaj on the 5th Instant at 3 P.M., with all the papers connected with the embezzlemen of salt money in that Taluk.

2. The amildar

wishes

wishes to refresh his memory by referring to the records already sent up to Government in the case, and he will appear at the Dewan's Office for this purpose before the appointed date. I request that he may kindly be furnished with the references he requires to enable him to study the case and prepare himself to answer the questions that he may be asked at the hearing of the case.

3. Notices have been issued for the appearance before the Honorable Councillor on the aforesaid date, of the parties furnished in the Case.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner

From

[illegible]

T. 123.

300,000 / 3,000 4-93.

Section

Class. [illegible]

## MADRAS RAILWAY LICENSED ~~TELEGRAPHS.~~

Local No.

To (Station) Bangalore.

From (Station) [illegible]

Serial No.

(14)

| No. | Words. | Day. | Hour. | Minute. | Official Instructions. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 38 | 13 | C. | C. | |

To (Person) The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of [illegible]

From (Person) The Deputy Commissioner of Kolar

1 Please 2 Retransmission
3 of 4 all
5 freight 6 [illegible]
7 with 8 [illegible]
9 [illegible] 10 [illegible]
11 And 12 all [illegible]
13 a 14 they
15 [illegible] 16 for
17 a 18 [illegible]
19 for 20 [illegible]
21 a 22 [illegible]
23 [illegible] 24
25 26
27 28
29 30
31 Wire 32

Very well. Do so. [illegible] 13/2/94

Received from L.L.
At 13 Hrs. [illegible] Mts. on the
By
Date [illegible]

Sent to L.L.
At Hrs. Mts. on the
By

Sender's Signature.

Signaller.

Submitted for orders.

13/2 The records were submitted for perusal [illegible]

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. 12547

Section
File No
Serial No

From The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District

(1.)

To

The ~~Chief Secretary~~ to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 13th February 1894.

Despatched 13th

Received

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. Camp No. 43.
No.

~~In reply to~~

SUBJECT.

Requests retransmission of the records connected with the late Head Gumasta Srinivasaraghavachar's appeal and to adjourn the case for a fortnight.

---

*References* (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office
Camp No 43. Dated the 13th February 1893.

To

(15)

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No: $\frac{215}{\text{Pet. } 1170}$ dated the 26th Ultimo and in continuation of my telegram of today's date, regarding the appeal preferred by Srinivasaraghavachar, late Head Gumasta, against this Office order in the case of embezzlement of Salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk, I have the honor to request that the entire records sent with my letter No: $\frac{553}{119}$ dated the 21st July 1892 may kindly be returned and the case adjourned for a fortnight so as to enable me to prepare and submit an explanatory memo on the several points mentioned by the Head Gumasta in the Statement submitted by him at the Dewan's Office

2. I beg also to solicit that Srini-

-vasaraghavachar

Srinivasaraghavachar may if the Government consider the measure called for be directed to appear before me to be examined on each of the points urged by him in his defence with a view to facilitate a clear elucidation of the facts on which he relies.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner

No 13726/Pet 1334 d 13/16·2·94.

Section — Encls 5 & records.
File No
Serial No

(16)

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

His letter Camp No 43
dated 13th Instant

---

Has the honor to forward herewith, as requested in the above, the records relating to the enquiry into the embezzlement of Salt License Fees in the Kolar Taluk, received with his letter No 553/119 dated 31st July 1892, and to intimate that on the receipt of ~~having awaited~~ his explanatory memo orders will be issued whether it will be necessary for him to depute the Amildar to the Dewan's office, & if so on what date, ~~the case has been adjourned to Saturday the 3rd March 1894.~~

The Dy Commr is at liberty

to ~~procure the attendance~~ summon ~~of~~ Srinivasaraghavachar and examine him with reference to any points on which his explanation may be considered necessary.

U.C.
13/12/10

By order

15/12

Chief Secretary

Rec. 15/12
To the [illegible] The Chief Secretary
[illegible]

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. 2793

Pet: 150

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

Section

File No

Serial No

U

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 28th August 94

Despatched 29th

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 838

No. 138

Re: reminders as per margin requesting the early submission with an Explanatory memo of the records relating to the case of Embezzlement of Salt Licence fees in the Kolar Taluk

Adverting to the above, I have the honour to state that after the collection of the necessary references, vouchers etc which took some time the case was finally

posted

Pet Br

C

Recd 31/8/94

Resubmit to the Revenue Commr

Separate the Reminders (& other papers wh may not be reqd for ref. ce) into a separate bundle

No Petn/242 dated 18th August 1894

No 3083/Pet 275 dated 22nd August 1894

No Petn 299 dated 27th August 1894

Petitioner should be informed that unless he appears before the Dy Comr & gives his explanation, his appeal will not be heard in this Office —

4/9/94

In draft 5/9

Offd 5/9

Section
Gen. Serial No. 32.]
File No 189
Serial No
No. ~~1489~~ 1498

Name of Petitioner. Sreenivasa Raghavachar Head Gumasta, Chintamani Taluq

Village.

Taluk.

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 23-11-94

Date of Receipt. 27-11-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner states that in obedience to the endorsement No 3492 d/6/9/94, he has furnished his explanation required, to the Dy Commr and that the Dy Commr is determined to maintain the order passed by him in my case, & prays that the whole record may be taken from the hands of the Deputy Commr and carry orders passed as the petitioner is suffering much for want of pay for the last 3½ years.

R. F. 59-92 is pump.

7/12/94

Submitted to the Ch. Secy.

Petr was informed that his appeal before Govt will not be heard till he appeared before the Dy. Commr and gave his explanation.

Petr says he has given his explanation but no effect has been received from the Dy. Commt.

The Dy. Commr has promised to send his explanatory memo in connection with the ~~[illegible]~~ case [illegible] said because [illegible] any considerable delay.

Petr prays for early disposal of his appeal.

7/12

Already [illegible] Report from [illegible] pending occasional [illegible] No reply is now

[illegible] 4/12

[illegible] 8/12

says that the required stamp
has been fixed to his former
appeal petition

No Stamp
27/11

1498

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. No. 147522
27-11-94

[illegible]

1894

3492
6.9.94

[illegible] 3 ½ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

༢༣—11—94 [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

189

*From*

*To*

*Dated*

*Despatched*

*Received*

*Enclosures No.*

*General No.*

*No.*

To

The Dy. Commr.
Kolar District

Dated 5/6-12-94

No. 9234/Pet: 912

This office no. 13726/Pet. 1334 dated 13th February 1894 issuing the complete records regarding the case of embezzlement of Salt License Fees in the Kolar Taluk to enable him to prepare an explanatory memo in the case & subsequent reminders marginally noted.

Pet: No. 242 d. 18.8.94.
3087/Pet. 275 d 22.8.~~9~~ 94
Pet. 299 d 27.8.9[illegible]
3942/Pet. 367 d. 5.9.94.

Has the honor to invite attention to the above, and to request that the records may be submitted with the explanatory memo at once.

2. The Govt. are getting impatient of the inordinate delay that has occurred in the submission of his report.

By order

Chief Secy.

Drftn
Cs'ndr
SKR
6/12

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. 7302

From Pet: 352

The Dy: Commissioner
Kolar District

Section

File No

Serial No

To

~~The Chief Secretary to the~~ Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 10 } December
Despatched 12 }

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 2132
No. 499

In reply to his doc. No. 2234/1892 dated the 8th September —

SUBJECT.

Submits explanation regarding the non submission of the report in the case of embezzlement of salt license fees in the Kolar taluk &c.

Revenue Commissioner
Notice -

21/1

& warned that if he does not appear within that date named his case would be disposed of without his being heard.

The Dy Comr is requested to fix a date within which Srinivasaraghavachar should appear before him & answer his questions. If he does not appear before him within the date named, the Dy Comr should submit his report on such information as is available in the records. ~~He should~~

2?/1/95

Pd 14/1

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Submitted to [illegible]
21/15/12

21/1 [redacted]

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated Camp [illegible] 10th December 94

No 2132/499
From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to your Docket No: 9234/Ret:912 dated the 6th instant requesting the immediate submission with the explanatory memo of the records, in the case of the embezzlement of Salt Licence Fees in the Kolar Taluk, I have the honor to solicit your attention to your memo No: 3742/Ret:367 dated 5th September 1894 forwarding copy of endorsement No: 3492 of the 4th Idem granted to Sreenivasa Raghavachar on the subject.

This individual who subsequently appeared before this office was given 2 lists of interrogatories relating respectively to Tarana (1884-85) and Parthiva (1885-86) to which he has replied very imperfectly and evasively thereby rendering it necessary for me to examine him with regard to each. He has yet to answer a number of
tions for Vyaya (1886-87) and to furnish the requisite
mation for the preparation of certain tabular state-
by which it is intended to place before Govern-
a more clear and detailed account of the

the numerous and indescribably great irregularities and frauds committed by him during the aforesaid 3 years.

Sreenivasa Raghavachar has abruptly left the place and unless he comes back and complies fully with this office requisitions and furnishes the particulars which are not ascertainable from any of the records left by him in the Taluk Cutcherry, it is not possible to submit a complete report to Government in the matter.

It may be stated here that it is to the interest of the appellant to appear before this office and furnish the necessary information in view to the report promised being submitted to Government, and that no avoidable delay will be allowed to occur in this office.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

bok Deputy Commissioner

Gen. Serial No. 30.

4

189

*From*

*The Chief Secretary to the*
*Dewan of Mysore.*

Section

File No

Serial No.

*Dated*

*Despatched*

*Received*

*Enclosures No.*

*General No.*
*No.*

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

No $\frac{12296}{\text{Pol: 1126}}$ D/ $\frac{25-1-95}{1572}$

His letter No $\frac{2132}{499}$ dated
10th December 1894

Section
File No
Serial No

---

With reference to the above the Deputy Commissioner is requested to fix a date within which Srinivasaraghavachary should appear before him and answer his questions, and warned that if he does not appear within ~~that~~ the date named, his case would be disposed of without his being heard. If he does not appear before him within the date named, the Deputy Commr should submit his report on such information as is available ~~available~~ in the records.

By Order
12/2/95
[illegible] Chief Secretary

[illegible] 25/

Section

Gen. Serial No. 323

Serial No. 189

| | |
|---|---|
| No. | 2399 |
| Name of Petitioner. | Subba Rao |
| Village. | Late Sirastedar |
| Taluk. | Sidlaghatta |
| District. | Kolar. |
| Date of Arzi. | |
| Date of Receipt. | |
| Date of Disposal. | |
| No. of Enclosures. | |

Reference.
U.J. 23/3

The file is put up.
M 23/3

Send a reminder to the Dy Commr requesting him to expedite submission of the report called for
U.J. 25/3

Drafted
S.K.R. 25/3

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner, while Sirastedar of Kolar had, through haste and over confidence in his subordinates, signed some deposit vouchers relating to some salt pans. This act of his was considered to have caused a loss of Rs 113-3-9 to Gt and the Dy: Commissioner ordered that ~~that~~ the amount should be recovered from the petitioner and that he should also be pensioned. The

amount was accordingly
recovered from the petitioner

With regard to his [illegible] pension
nothing has been settled as
yet although 32 months have
elapsed after the decision of
the Dy: Commissioner.

prays that his pension may
be soon settled & paid to
him.

No 2399

[illegible] DEWAN'S [illegible]
FOREIGN DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 2399R
20-3-95

[illegible]
[illegible]

1895 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 13-3-

[illegible]

15759
P1359 D. 25/3/95

on 25/3/95
A reminder was sent, to the D. Commr to send the further report in connection with the Salt embezzlement case of the Kol[illegible].

6/4.

10/4

Drafted
9/4

Section ..........

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

Serial No. ........ 1895

No. 2557

Name of Petitioner. B. Subba Rao
suspended Sheristedar
of [illegible] Taluk
c/o S. [illegible] Rao
[illegible]

Village.

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arzi. 20 - 2 - 95

Date of Receipt. 29 - 3 - 95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 1

ABSTRACT.

States that after serving faithfully and efficiently as [illegible], Dy. Munshi, Head Munshi and Taluk Sheristedar in the Chickballapur Sub Division office for a long time he was at last made a [illegible] class Sheristedar and posted to Kolar Taluk; that being new to the office and relying on the subordinates he [illegible] refund of an amount in deposit which eventually proved to be a wrong party - that accordingly the amount was recovered from him and he was suspended from office - Prays that as he is quite innocent justice may be done to him early.

4/4.

5/4

No 2507

MYSO[illegible]
PETITI[illegible]
REGD. [illegible] 2507.R
DATE 29-3-95

Sir K. Seshadri Iyer K.C.S.I.
Dewan of Mysore.

Most Honored Patron.

It is with great respect and humility the undersigned begs to approach with this humble petition which he hopes will never fail to receive your Excellency's unique consideration and charitable judgment.

Your Excellency's humble petitioner had submitted his grievances just about a week ago, which might have put your Excellency in the acquaintance of his case. Nevertheless the existing circumstances are such as to compell h to appeal his generosity once more at this critical juncture to a Patron and Statesman of broad views and sympathetic feelings

Your Excellency's humble petitioner was a Nazir, deputy Munshi, Head Munshi and Naib Sheristadar in the Chick-ballapur Sub division Office for a long series of years. During the revision in 1879 which took place in the Commission the designation Naib Sheristadar was transformed into Head Munshi without meddling with the pay. The Sub division Office located at Chick-ballapur hitherto was transferred to the Head-Quarters of the District under the then Proceedings. The foregoing officers of the Court having approved of his humble capabilities, honesty and punctuality in the discharge of his legitimate functions commended him for the for the next grade of office according to rank. A copy of the testimonials granted to him by the several officers is herein appended for kind perusal and consideration. While things stood at this rate Mr. K. Ramachandra Rao the Genl. Asstt. Commissioner recommended him for a Dy. Amildarship which not being complied with, the poor petitioner was sent up as a first class Sheristadar to Kolar Taluk.

Since the history from here narrates a different state of things, it invites your excellency's versatile attention and broad views of the matter.

Within a short period of a week of his assumption of the charge of his new office two individuals claimed their deposite money Namely 112 Rs to be given back. Both the Head Gumasta and the Nagadi Gumasta not only assured the fact of this amount to be given to the very same individuals but showed in the Deposite Register this amount pending in deposite from a long time. They moreover drafted receipts duly certifying thereon as to the identity of the individuals. The poor petitioner being new to the office and reposing on the honesty and trustworthyness of these Gumastas ordered the payment of the money, if it were in deposite, to the respective individuals. A similar item in the said Register had been cleared twice

Head Gumasta was in-charge of Treasury.

The petitioner was guided to follow by these precedent instances.

This was subsequently found out to be incorrect payment and this sum was actually realized from the petitioner under the orders of Mr Tradia. This is a mistake brought home by the deputy Commissioner ~~against the petitioner~~

The petitioner begs to point ~~out~~ here that he is quite new to the office, and no time to learn the characters of these gumastas, nor did he dream that these Gumastas to the great discredit of their official capacity enter false accounts in the Government Registers. The petitioner is indeed quite novel to this sort of knavery, dishonesty audacity since a most part of his

Service was spent in higher offices. In short the petitioner was simply duped by these Gumastas. What ~~could~~ an officer do if the Subordinates try their best to ensnare? Does not this mistake deserve to be overlooked owing the novelty of his situation, Does not the petitioner deserve any consideration at least from the Deputy Commissioner in consideration of his long standing and approved service for the last 31 long years. Did Mr Readia exempt him from the sum being realized from the petitioner which he ordered to be paid. Did not the petitioner's auspicious star which has guided him quietly and smoothly on the tide of his official career since so many years become disastrous at this moment owing to his ill-luck, which is beyond the power of man to shun.

No consideration of his long service

no good-name earned under Officers not less than 2 [illegible] in number who were all held to be most deserving and competent Officers in the State, no sympathy no natural feelings moved Mr Nadiah to hold back his furious pen without aiming at the liveli-hood of the petitioner

The hardships and calamities which the petitioner has been experiencing since 2 years when he was deprived of the means of liveli-hood actuated him to make appeals to a sympathising and kindred heart in the conviction th his case will be viewed in the most tender an parental light with all the large-hear -ness and philosophic mind of a States-man who scorns to delight in injury and rejoices in the social well-being of all

The administration of Mysore has been marked a new epoc under your regime which is renowned for wisdom, justice, & generosity, and forgiveness.

In conclusion the petitioner humbly solicits to meet justice at your Excellency's hands at an early date and favor an endorsement for the same

For this kindness he is bound in duty &c.

Your Excellency's most obdt. Servt.

Sd/ B. Subba Rao

20th February, 1895 } Suspended Sheristadar of Siddlaghata Taluk

Address

His name
C/o S. Gungadhar Rao
Gubbi, Tumkur
district.

## Testimonials of Subba Rao

1 Fast writer clever judicial and a Rev. Munshi, very honest in the discharge of his duties and deserves promotion.

(Signed) Syed Ameer Ahmed
Sub Div. Officer

2. As a mark of my approbation of Subba Rao's services I have promote him to the 1st Munshiship of the Cou

(Sd) S. B. Krishnaswamiengar
Sub Div. Offr.

3. This is a capital Munshi ........ as a munshi his services are invaluable. If the Naib Sheristadar of the Court had been vacant in my days I had had no hesitation in submitting his name for the appointment to which he is fully qualified in my opinion.

(Sd) T. V. Tirumalachariar
Sub. Div. Offr.

9. I think this is the ablest official in the establishment. He has made a fair progress in the knowledge of Codes. He has posted himself up to date very well in every detail of the Criminal work as is now conducted. He seems to bear a very good character on the whole. He deserves every consideration from Government

(Sd) P. N. Purnaya
Genl Asst Commr

10. Head Munshi Subba Rao's unassuming character, great obedience combined with intelligence, probity commend him for a higher post.

(Sd) B. Thirumalachar
Gl Asst Commr

11. Messrs Raghunatha Rao, T. Chinnayangar and S. Krishnaiengar are of the same opinion.

Gen. 31.]

189 13803

Re 2555

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Section

File No.

Serial No.

2

To
The Chief Secretary to the Government
~~Durbar~~ of Mysore.
1

Dated 3rd April '95

Despatched [illegible] April '95

Received

General No. 3768
No. 1235

Enclosure No.

Submitting further report in connection with the embezzlement of Salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk.

Submitted to the Commissioner

This file has been pending before Govt from July 1891.

I have not submitted the whole file as the Dy Commrs final report has not yet been received.

19/4

Ask the D.C. for
[illegible] when he can
as the matter
has been pending
a report since
1891

20/4/95

Draft 1
SUR 20/4

Recd 18/4

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Dated the 13th April 1895.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No. 12296/Pet: 1125 dated the 25th January last and subsequent reminders as per margin regarding the submission of a further report in connection with the embezzlement of Salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk, I have the honor to state that Srinivasaraghavachar was duly served with a notice requiring him to appear before me on the 15th Ultimo to answer my questions but he has failed to comply with the requisition. His wilful absence and consequent evasion of an examination which is necessary for various reasons has left much important matter unelicited and certain additional irregularities since discovered unexplained by him.

No. 3750/Pet: 1359 dated 25th March 1895.
No. Pet/1385 dated 3rd April 1895.

As however the Docket under acknowledgment directs that if he does not appear before me as required the report should

should be submitted on such information as is available in the records, the same is being prepared as well as it could be done under the existing disadvantages and with reference to the unsatisfactory and incomplete replies given by him to such of the questions as he has answered and will be submitted as soon as ready.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

Gen. 30.]

1895

*From*

*The Chief Secretary to the*
*Dewan of Mysore,*

Section
File No
Serial No

*To*

The Dy. Commr.
Kolar Dt.

23

*Dated*
*Despatched* } 22nd April 95

*Received*

*General No.* Pol
*No.* 1452

*Enclousure No.*

~~This Office~~ His No. 3768 dated 13 April 1895 1235
stating that his report in connection with the case of Embezzlement of Salt license fees in the Kolar Taluk is in preparation & will be soon submitted

and ~~subsequent reminder marginally noted.~~

---

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request ~~an early reply thereto.~~ that the report may be ~~despatched~~ Expedited as the matter has been pending before Govt. since 1891

By order,

Draft
For Dy. Sr. ~~Under~~ Secretary.
22/4/95

M.G.C.P.B– 6-10-94—2000

Reminder.

Urgent do

Section

File No

Serial No [illegible]

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Dated 5th Sept /95

No 2689 / P. 540

This office No Lt./1452 dated 22d April 1895 requesting early submission of report & records relating to the embezzlement of salt license fees in the Kolar Taluk

---

In drawing attention to the above, has the honor to observe that the report, said to be under preparation in April last, (vide letter No 3768/1235 dated 13 April 1895), has not yet been received in ~~this~~ ~~office~~, and to request that the report & the records of the case may be submitted to this office without further delay.

By order
5-9-95
Ch. Secretary

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 3177
No. 893
19 OCT. 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

Gen. 31.]

Section

File No

Serial No

~~From~~ The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

The Secretary to the Government
Revenue ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 16th September

Despatched 16-10-95

Received

General No. 1457

No. 366

Enclosure No. 2 Packets

Will follow in Registered packets.

Submitting certain papers connected with Srinivasa-Raghavachar, regarding the embezzlement of Salt License fees in the Kolar Taluq-

[illegible]
with 2 Packets
18/10/95

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated ~~15th~~ 10th ~~October~~ September 1892

To

The Revenue Secretary
to the Government of Mysore

Sir,

Adverting to previous correspondence ending with your order No. $\frac{2080}{540}$ dated the 5th instant regarding the embezzlement of salt licence fees in the Kolar Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith the marginally noted x papers and to state that a perusal of these and this office letter No. $\frac{555}{119}$ dated 3rd July 1892 with its enclosures will show the various irregularities and frauds committed by the appellant Srinivasa Raghavachar during the time he was the Head Gumastah of the Taluk.

x Calendar of Charges (in English) against Srinivasa Raghavachar, late Head Gumastah Chintamani Taluk in connection with the embezzlement of Salt License fees in the Kolar Taluk during the period he was Head Gumastah in the last mentioned Taluk (with its enclosures)
Do —— (in Canarese) —— Do —— do

2. I also append three Canarese lists of interrogatories to the appellant, 1st Tarana, 2nd Parthiva, and 3rd Vyaya. Of these, the two former have been answered by him very imperfectly and evasively, while the third could not be put into his hands as he left Kolar abruptly without furnishing this office with the information required of him for the preparation of certain statements which it was considered necessary to get up before allowing him an opportunity to

answer

answer the questions therein contained. He persistently failed to appear before me for a searching examination on each and every one of the points mentioned in the said list and the enclosed calendar had therefore to be prepared on the available information as directed in the Chief Secretary's docket No. 12296/Pet 1126 dated the 20th January 1896 which is a reply to this office reference on the subject.

3. The officials who held charge of the Talook during the period of the embezzlement as specified in para 2 of my letter quoted above have no doubt betrayed gross negligence and laid themselves widely open to blame by allowing their minor officials undue and uncontrolled latitude in matters to which they should have paid their personal attention but that circumstance cannot in any way extenuate the guilt of the appellant who signally betrayed the trust reposed in him rightly or wrongly by his official superiors and as a public servant disgracefully failed to discharge honestly and faithfully the duties entrusted to or assumed by him.

4. The original records connected with the case as per accompanying list are herewith

Submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required. Such of the papers Enumerated in the margin of the Chief Secretary's docket No. $\frac{1075}{\text{Pet. [illegible]}}$ dated the 18th December 1893 as are forthcoming together with register copies of those the originals of which are not available have also been attached to the file. 11/1/94

5. Soona Rao, Sheristadar of the Sidlaghatta Taluq who was ordered by me to retire under the circumstances explained in my letter No. $\frac{22}{1/2}$ dated the 7th July 1892 was subsequently placed under suspension pending the disposal of this case in accordance with the instructions conveyed in Government Proceedings No. $\frac{855}{\text{R.F. 59-92}}$ dated the 10th Instant.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

F. [illegible]
Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

Issue

[illegible]
[illegible] 14-11-90
Draft for approval

నం 3039/[illegible]

Section
File No
Serial No

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1893 [illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]. అయితే, ఈ అర్థశా

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible] 3-3-9 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible], ~~[illegible]~~

Stet

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

~~[illegible]~~

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

55 సంవత్సరముల క్రిందటనుండి,

~~[illegible]~~ ఇనాముగానుండినందున [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ఆ [illegible]

[illegible] ఇచ్చినట్లు [illegible]

ఉత్తరువు [illegible] శ్రీ

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible].

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

౧౩ నవంబరు 1896

By order

Draft [illegible] 13/11/96

For Secretary

13-11-96

25

Section

File No Exapl

Serial No

Proceedings of the Government No $\frac{853}{\text{R.7 59-92}}$ dated 19th July 1892 directing the suspension of Subbarow Shiristidar Siddlaghatta Taluk pending the submission of a full report from the Dy Commr. Kolar District in the case of the embezzlement of the Salt-pan License Fees in the Kolar Taluk.

2. Letter from the Dy Commr Kolar District No $\frac{1457}{360}$ dy 16th September 1895, submitting certain papers in connection with the case of the embezzlement referred to above

3. Petition from the Taluk Sheristadar

Sheristedar Subbarow
No 3039 dated 10 May 1893
praying for the grant
to him of the pension to
which he is entitled

Order thereon. No 4402/P. 677 d/ 17.11.96

The Government have perused the whole of the papers relating to the charges formulated against Subbarow late Sheristedar of the Siddlaghatta Taluk and have no hesitation whatever in saying that the Sheristedar has been harshly and inconsiderately treated. His case is the more painful in that he has had to wait unnecessarily long as a suspended official

2. The irregularity which

has

has been attributed
to ~~[illegible]~~ Subbarow is that
when he was Sheristedar
of the Kolar Taluk, he
signed the Taluk
Annual Accounts
without scrutiny and
that he thereby facilitated
the ~~preparation~~ perpetration of frauds
and other irregularities by the
Taluk Head Gumasta and
the Nagadi Gumasta, both of
whom have been dismissed
though an appeal by the
former is yet pending
~~[illegible]~~ before the Govt
But the gravity of this
neglect will be much
mitigated when it is
borne in mind that
Subbarow had but recently
been transferred as a
Taluk Sheristedar from
his appointment in the
Chickballapur Sub-Division
Office

Office He confesses to having trusted the Head Gumasta and he has suffered out of all proportion for it

3. Another irregularity of which he has been found guilty is that he refunded moneys in deposit to wrong persons. This he admitted in a straight-forward manner and pleaded inexperience. He attempted no defence and paid up the amount viz, Rs 113-3-9 which he had thus wrongly refunded The transactions referred to a period when he had not joined the Taluk and it is difficult to detect any gross negligence if, in the matter of this repayment the Shirestedar

allowed

allowed himself to be
guided by the statements,
verifications & identifications
of the Head and ~~the~~ Nagadi
Gumastas If he did not
act as carefully as he
ought to have done he
has been punished
more than adequately
for it. It has however to
be observed that his
honor is unsullied and
that his good character
which has been testified
to in excellent terms
by all his superior officers
remains quite honorable.
If in the course of the
enquiry of this case he
had not outgrown the
limit of fifty five years
(the date of his birth
being 13 April 1839) and
the Govt had not already
declared him unfit
for

for further Service he should have been re-instated in his appointment

4. Under these circumstances, Subbarao's Suspension will be withdrawn and his retirement ~~sanctioned~~ from the Service sanctioned from the date on which he was relieved of his duties. The Dy. Commr. Kolar District is requested to submit ~~his~~ The Sheristedar's Pension Papers to the Govt. at an early date returning to him his Security amount without the least delay. ~~A copy of the Endorsement granted to him in the matter from this Office is forwarded to the Dy. Commr. for information.~~

5. The Appeal of

of Sreenevasa Raghava Char the Taluk Head Goomasta above referred to, pending before the Govt, is posted for hearing on Thursday the 26th instant. The Dy Commr, [illegible] is requested to direct sa the Revenue Sheristedar of the ~~Kolar~~ District to be present at the Dewan's Office on the above date with all needful references so as to be able to furnish such information as may be required in the matter.

[illegible] all [illegible]
19/11/96

17/11/96

C for Secretary

16/11/96

To
The Deputy Commr
Kolar Distt.

The Khan Sah. Pandeerise
Fas Embezzlement case.
Draft order for affil

Draft for [illegible]

[illegible]

Section [illegible]
File No
Serial No [illegible]

[illegible]

$\frac{4402}{P.\,677}$ ×

[illegible]

+ Vol.
volunteers [illegible]
when required
here for [illegible]
[illegible]
19-11-98

[illegible]

[illegible] 30 cents [illegible] yesterday [illegible] a slight [illegible] 1833 [illegible]

[illegible]

The case may under the circumstances represented be reposted to some other date —

19-11-96

By all means

19/11/96

Do so & intimate hearing date to Dy Commr & to the appellant

20/11

Posted 3 dates [illegible] to D.C. [illegible] & notice [illegible] appellant [illegible] 20/11

(27) 189

File No

Serial No

From

To

The Deputy Commr
Kolar District.

Dated 20th
Despatched Novr/96.
Received
General No. 4508
P. No. 704

Enclosure No.

With reference to the Deputy Commr's D.O. letter of the 18th instant; has the honour to state that the appeal of Srinivasaraghavachar has been adjourned to 3rd Decembe next, and to request that the Revenue Sheristadar of the District may be directed to be present at the Dewan's office on that date.

By Order

Draft.

20/11/96
For Secretary.

20/11

Serial No.

To

The Deputy Commr.
Kolar Dt.

Pet / 883 d/ 11-12-96

Has the honor to state that the appeal of Srinivasa-raghavachar late Head Gumasta Kolar Taluk has been adjourned to the 14th instant for further hearing, and to request that the Revenue Sheristadar of the Dy. Commr's Office, who leaves this for Kolar tomorrow morning, may be sent here again to be present at the hearing on Monday with the additional records of which he has charge.

By order

Section

File No.

Serial

Gen. 31.]

189 Pet 421/373

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Secretary to the
Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
Revenue & General Departments

Dated 18th
Despatched 19th } December 1896
Received

General No. 2364
No. 580

Enclosure No. 1 File returned with this office No 3562/P.504 d/11-10-96

His Docket No. Pet/883 dated

11th Instant.

— .. —

Adverting to the above, has the honor to submit herewith as per accompanying Farist certain additional papers for reference in the case of Sreenivasaraghavachar late Head Gumasta Kolar Taluk and to request that the same may be filed with the records of the case.—

M. Krishnama for
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

21/12

Recd 22/12

Subd with Memo No 883.

23/12

[illegible]

23/12

The file has been sent to the 2nd Councillor.

23/12

Subd to the 2nd Councillor in contn

23/12

Recd 7 P.M.
23/12/96.

Why are these kept separate —
Let me have all the papers

24/1/97

File No.

Serial No.

నంబర్ 403-3/498 [illegible]

[illegible]

12-10-97

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 28 [illegible] 1917

12

[illegible]

By order

Draft -

For Secretary -

S.V.
28/9/17.

2 drafts

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

File No

Serial No.

Read:-

(1) Petition No 403 dated 6th August 1892, presented by Srinivasa Raghavachar late Head Gumasta of the Chintamani Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of Kolar dismissing him from service on the ground that he misappropriated, while he was the Head Gumasta of the Kolar Taluk, a large amount of ~~the~~ the Salt-pan License fees of that Taluk, and calling upon him to make good the ~~[illegible]~~ amount.

(2) Correspondence ending with docket No $\frac{2364}{580}$ dated 18th December 1896, from the Deputy

Commr. Kolar District submitting certain additional records connected with the case.

(3) Records of the case, and the Calendar, showing in detail the charges brought against Srinivasa Raghavachar in connection with the embezzlement of Salt License fees.

— v —

Order thereon. No. $\frac{3562}{R.505}$ d/ $\frac{11}{12}$.10.97

After a careful examination of the, records and after hearing Srinivasa Rao, District Revenue Sheristadar, and the Petitioner, Government have come to the conclusion that no fraud can be brought home to the Petitioner. He has not been shown to have ~~been~~ misappropriated

Govt.

Government money. Nor has any culpable negligence or irregularity been established against him. The confusion in which the management of this revenue was found is due to lack of supervision in the District Office and the apathy and indifference of the Amildars of the time. It is not possible to take notice of their conduct at this distance of time; but that is no reason why a subordinate official in the position of the Petitioner should be punished with dismissal for their omissions and irregularities.

The order dismissing the Petitioner is set aside and his immediate restoration to his appointment is directed.

M
For Secretary

Draft

C2

To The Deputy Commr
Kolar District, with records^θ^ + [illegible]

12-10-97 [illegible]

θ Sent separately in his parcels.

S.W. 28/9/97

Section
File No.
Serial No.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated 11th November 92

No.

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments
Bangalore.—

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No. 558/R506 dated 11th Instant setting aside the order dismissing [illegible] Rajanna from late Head [illegible] of the Chintamani Taluk and directing his immediate restoration to his appointment, I have the honor to report that the official was not placed under suspension as directed in Government Proceedings No. 853/R5792 dated the 19th July 92 but the Amildar again reported in his letter No. 553/114 dated the 3rd July 92 that the Head [illegible] had been removed from the service and that steps would be adopted to prosecute him in case he failed to pay

Gen. 31

Section

File No

Serial No.

3418
1897 2093

Sub to 2nd Cr

18/11/97

Rd 6 Pm.
18.11.97

From Dy. Commissioner
Kolar District

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Depts
Bangalore

Dated 11th November
Despatched 11
Received

General No. 1597
No. 459

Enclosure No.

An appointment of Head Gomasta may be given to Sreenivasaraghavachar. Whether it is in ~~at~~ Chintamani or elsewhere is immaterial – but he should properly be restored to a Hd Gomastaship

25/12/97

KL 27/12/97

SS for draft
28/12/97

Recd & draft Subd.
3/1/98

Enquiring to what appointment Sreenivasa Raghavachar is to be appointed.—

RW 15-11-97

Petn Br.

Please put up references.

17/11.

R 759 of 92 containing the refs quoted within is put up.

AK
17/11/97.

Submitted for orders to Secretary.

N.B. The wording of the orders is "his immediate restoration to his appointment."

17/11/97 17/11/97

up the defalcated amounts. Since the post of the head Gumashta is not vacant. It was permanently filled up and several changes of hands have also taken place since then:-

I request therefore to be kindly instructed whether [illegible] Chr, should be reinstated to his appointment of Head Gumashta at Chintamony or elsewhere or it would be enough to give him an appointment on Rupees 20, which he was drawing at the time, as the post of Head Gumashta is now worth Rs 25 to 30.-

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt Servant

Deputy Commissioner

Tran
Compd
[illegible]

Read:— (32)

Letter No. 1091/459 dated 11th November 1897 from the Dy Commr, Kolar District, Soliciting instructions as to whether Srinivasa Raghavachar, late Head Gumasta of the Chintamani Taluk, who has been ordered in Govt. Procgs no. 3562/P505 d 11.10.97, to be restored to his appointment, should be appointed as Head Gumasta on Rs. 25 rising to 30 at Chintamani or elsewhere, or whether he may be provided with an appointment of Rs 20 which was his pay as Hd Gumasta of the Chintamani Taluk, ~~as his former~~ which last appointment has already been filled up.

6488.

No. RT. 5942 d/15.1.98
16

Order thereon:—

Govt. direct that Srinivas Raghavachar be provided with an appointment of Head Gumasta, which is the post he formerly held, either at Chintamani or elsewhere.

8/1/98

4
10-1-98

5/1/98

6/1/98

Secretary.

To.
The Dy. Commr.
Kolar District.

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Office.

No. 3448 Sup
1013

Dated Kolar 4th April /98.

To

The Secretary to the
Govt: of Mysore
General & Revenue Deptts.

Serial ...
File No ...
Serial No ...

Sir,

I have the honour to state that Srinivasa Raghavachar late Head Gumasta of the Chintamani Taluk was under suspension from December 1891 to June 1892 and he was afterwards dismissed from the service by my predecessor Mr Madiah on the ground that he misappropriated while he was the Head Gumasta of the Kolar Taluk, a large amount of the salt pan licence fees of that Taluk and he was called upon to make good the amount.

On appeal by the official in question, the Government in Proceedings No: $\frac{3562}{6506}$ of the 11th October 1897, concluded that no fraud could be brought home to the petitioner, that he was not shown to have misappropri-

ated

1299

REVENUE DEWAN'S OFFICE DEWAN OF MYSORE
Gen. Serial No. 311
7638
1898
R 4523
9048
1238
33

From The Dy. Commissioner
Kolar District

Section.
File No.
Serial No.

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue Department
Bangalore

Dated 14th } April
Despatched do }
Received

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 3448 } 1897-98
No. 1013

Submitted for favorable considera-
tion ~~[illegible]~~ an application
from [illegible]
Khan for arrears of
pay &c

To Rev. Brand.
Please put up the
reference
[illegible]
18. 4. 98

The file No 5 [illegible] put up
[illegible] 19/4/98

Recd 21/4/98 Sub[illegible] pender.
[illegible] 21/4/98

Y
Submitted to the Rev. Branch
[illegible] 21/4/98

Rev 22/4

[illegible]

R. [illegible]
Submitted [illegible]
forwarded.

[illegible] 23/4/98

Please see paper
Serial 1030
in the file - The
final order is silent
on the point of giving
arrears of pay.
[illegible] 23/4/98

Submitted to Rev: Cr. for instruction pl.

The order directing
the restoration of the
offl was passed by the 2nd
Cr. If it was an
honourable acquittal, full
pay is admissible; otherwise
such portion as the
appellate authority may
deem expedient -
25/4/98

Preg
16. 4. 98
[illegible]

Pro: 3532 / P 505 d 11-10-97 & connected
papers [illegible] G.O. No: 3418 / R 2393
from Dt. M. Kolar No: 1591 / 459 d 11-11-97 & sent to the
Rev. Pro. in 17/11/97 [illegible] 18/4

misappropriated Government money and that no culpable negligence or irregularity established against him. In this view the explanations [illegible] of the official were accepted and his immediate restoration to his appointment recommended.

4th There was no vacancy [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] Lāl [illegible] has been appointed Police 2nd Inspector in the [illegible] in District office for lack of a vacancy of the post applied to.

He has now applied for back pay under clause (b)(ii) of Article 135 of the [illegible] Civil Regulation [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible] with [illegible] the Government [illegible] [illegible] which do not contain any direction on this point.

Please see rule 32

whereas S.R. [illegible] requires [illegible] when [illegible] post of a [illegible]

[illegible]

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner
Kota [illegible]

[illegible]

11/9/0 4

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1891 [illegible]

[illegible] 1897 [illegible]

[illegible] 20 [illegible]

[illegible] 16 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 28 [illegible]

[illegible] 91 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

१९ — ४ — ९८

[illegible]

Section..........
File No..........
Serial No..........

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1892 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1897 [illegible] 12
[illegible] 1498 [illegible]
403
[illegible]

[illegible] 1891 [illegible]
[illegible] 1891 [illegible]
[illegible] 91 [illegible]
23 [illegible]
[illegible] 24 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 1897 [illegible]
[illegible] 16 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 1891 [illegible]
[illegible] 1897 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4-4-98

[illegible]

Read:-

Letter No: 448/1013 dated 4th April 1898 from the Dy. Commr, Kolar District reporting with reference to Govt Pro: No 6488/8759-92 3.12.97. that pending the occurrence of a vacancy of Head Gumasta's post, Srinivasa Raghava Char, late Head Gumasta of the Chintamani Taluk, has been appointed as Police 3rd Munshi (on Rs 25) in the district office, and submitting for orders the Petition of Srinivasa Raghava Char praying for the disbursement of the Circar's of pay due to him for the period during which he was without employment ~~under dismissal~~ i.e. from 1st July 1891 to 15th Novr 1897.

No. 2589-90 / Rev. 5-9-92 d. 5/11/98 30

---

Order thereon:-

In their Procgs No. 3562/B505 11.10.1897 ordering Srinivasa Raghavachar's restoration to his appointment, Govt's held that no fraud could be brought home to ~~the~~ him ~~Petitioner~~, ~~as~~ that he was not shewn to have misappropriated Govt money, and that no culpable negligence or irregularity had been established against him, ~~he should be considered to have been honorably acquitted of the charges brought against him~~ under these circumstances Govt are ~~therefore~~ pleased to Sanction under article 136-(b) i of the Mysore Service Regulations, the payment to Srinivasa Raghavachar of his full Salary at Rs 20 per month for the period ~~during which he had been dismissed from Service~~. mentioned above.

27-6-98

H.B.
25/6/98 K 25/6/98 Secretary

To
The Dy Commr
Kolar District
" Comptr, Mysore Govt

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 .

*From*

*To*

*Dated*

*Despatched*

*Received*

**Enclosures No.**

*General No.*

*No.*

Joseph Hornickel